

Regional Depository Library Survey: Summary of Results

GPO sent this survey to directors/deans of regional Federal depository libraries in April 2008. There was a 100% response rate, though there were some statements to which there were no responses.

1. Please enter your Depository Library #:

	Response Count
	52
Answered question	52
Skipped question	0

2. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Response Count
Space for housing Federal depository print publications is sufficient for 5 years.	7.8% (4)	15.7% (8)	13.7% (7)	41.2% (21)	21.6% (11)	51
Space for housing Federal depository microfiche is sufficient for 5 years.	3.9% (2)	17.6% (9)	9.8% (5)	43.1% (22)	25.5% (13)	51
Space for housing Federal depository tangible electronic publications is sufficient for 5 years.	4.0% (2)	10.0% (5)	4.0% (2)	58.0% (29)	24.0% (12)	50
My library does not have an adequate number of computers for the public to access online depository materials.	50.0% (26)	42.3% (22)	0.0% (0)	7.7% (4)	0.0% (0)	52
There is enough professional staff to support the depository operation in my library.	4.0% (2)	24.0% (12)	12.0% (6)	54.0% (27)	6.0% (3)	50
There is enough support staff to support the depository operation in my library.	3.9% (2)	17.6% (9)	13.7% (7)	62.7% (32)	2.0% (1)	51
There is enough temporary staff (e.g., students, volunteers) to help support the depository operation in my library.	5.9% (3)	9.8% (5)	33.3% (17)	47.1% (24)	3.9% (2)	51
There is enough staff in my library to support regional responsibilities to selectives in the region.	5.9% (3)	37.3% (19)	9.8% (5)	45.1% (23)	2.0% (1)	51
My library will consider serving as a regional for selective Federal depository libraries in neighboring states.	25.5% (13)	29.4% (15)	17.6% (9)	17.6% (9)	9.8% (5)	51
The Federal depository services in my library are seldom used.	38.5% (20)	51.9% (27)	1.9% (1)	5.8% (3)	1.9% (1)	52
The tangible Federal depository collection is frequently used.	2.0% (1)	15.7% (8)	13.7% (7)	51.0% (26)	17.6% (9)	51
A primarily online Federal Depository Library Program has expanded service opportunities in my library.	0.0% (0)	5.9% (3)	13.7% (7)	60.8% (31)	19.6% (10)	51

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Response Count
Regional library staff has sufficient support to conduct collection management training sessions for selective depository libraries in the region they serve.	13.7% (7)	27.5% (14)	15.7% (8)	43.1% (22)	0.0% (0)	51
Financial support to cover the costs of regional depository operations continues to increase.	33.3% (17)	39.2% (20)	13.7% (7)	11.8% (6)	2.0% (1)	51
I am prepared to expand the services provided to selective depositories in the region I serve.	15.7% (8)	39.2% (20)	19.6% (10)	23.5% (12)	2.0% (1)	51
Changes in depository library services are consistent with changes in other library services.	5.9% (3)	5.9% (3)	11.8% (6)	64.7% (33)	11.8% (6)	51
Changes in the depository collection are consistent with changes in other library collections.	3.9% (2)	15.7% (8)	15.7% (8)	56.9% (29)	7.8% (4)	51
Reallocation of funds within a static library budget resulted in less financial support for the depository operation.	9.6% (5)	28.8% (15)	19.2% (10)	26.9% (14)	15.4% (8)	52
My library's participation in statewide and regional consortia allows increased services to the people of my region.	0.0% (0)	0.0% (0)	11.8% (6)	64.7% (33)	23.5% (12)	51
The funding outlook for my library looks promising over the next 3-5 years; a budget increase is expected.	38.5% (20)	40.4% (21)	19.2% (10)	0.0% (0)	1.9% (1)	52
Federal depository services would improve if GPO placed consultants in the region I serve or the neighboring region.	9.8% (5)	17.6% (9)	29.4% (15)	31.4% (16)	11.8% (6)	51
The online information environment (e.g., network security, licensing agreements) has forced a discrepancy in Internet access provided to the general public and my library's primary clientele.	19.2% (10)	50.0% (26)	7.7% (4)	21.2% (11)	1.9% (1)	52
Budgetary constraints at my library have caused a decline in regional services to selective depositories in my region.	7.8% (4)	39.2% (20)	23.5% (12)	25.5% (13)	3.9% (2)	51
My library does not have a strong record of promoting Federal depository collections and services to constituencies other than the library's primary clientele.	17.6% (9)	41.2% (21)	3.9% (2)	29.4% (15)	7.8% (4)	51
If the option was available to regional depository libraries, my library would become as "virtual" as possible.	13.7% (7)	17.6% (9)	15.7% (8)	27.5% (14)	25.5% (13)	51
My library is considering relinquishing regional depository status and becoming a selective depository library.	49.0% (25)	25.5% (13)	5.9% (3)	13.7% (7)	5.9% (3)	51

3. Please provide any comments, further explanations, or observations about the current or projected conditions of your regional depository library specifically or the Federal Depository Library Program generally.

	Response Count
	35
Answered question	35
Skipped question	17

The State Library of Pennsylvania has recently celebrated its 150th anniversary as a federal depository library and 40 years as a Regional Depository. This shows the commitment of the State Library of Pennsylvania as a federal depository. The State Library is contemplating the moving of its tangible collection from a closed stack area to a more accessible area in our Law/Government Publications Reading Room. This will allow for more accessibility than ever before for our paper U.S. documents. Our library has increased the involvement of our regional coordinator by being involved with such projects as "Government Information Online", being part of the focus groups on the FDLP Desktop and the FDsys pages, participating in "Browse Topics", and the testing group for the "Needs & Offers" page of the FDLP desktop. The Regional Coordinator has reached out to selectives in our states by reinstating the State meeting that had not been held for almost ten years previous to this administration. The Regional Coordinator has recently been instrumental in encouraging selectives in the western part of our state to have a subgroup of their own. The Regional coordinator has also used the social networking tool Facebook in order to better communicate with the selectives in the Commonwealth. This tool is also used with the laborious task of dealing with the Needs & Offers lists that come in almost daily to our library. Being one of the Regionals with one of the largest numbers of selectives under one person it is a time consuming task. The use of a consultant sponsored by the Government Printing Office would be helpful in the coverage of training or consulting with many of the selectives that the Regional Coordinator does not get to see because of time and traveling costs constraints. The cost of advising the selectives and traveling to the fall and Spring Depository meetings is the second largest expense of our budget allocated to staff travel other than the Director. The most heavily used areas of our government collection are the Census materials, NOAA weather data, as well as our legislative and judicial materials. The materials are also heavily used by the local middle school and high school population for National History Day. Many of the selectives ask for ILL and copies of microforms that only the Regional library holds. The concern that Pennsylvania has will be for storage and migration of electronic materials. There are already many documents that are unreadable or unavailable due to changes in electronic formats. As more and more documents are available electronically the storage and retrieval of these documents will be challenge in the future. The preservation of the paper materials will also be an issue as well. The library feels that any digitization budget should go to the preservation of Pennsylvania documents first since the State Library of Pennsylvania may be the only repository of this information rather than the several repositories of U.S. government information.

The AUM Library is in a state of transition. Budgetary concerns have reduced available staffing for the library by two FTE positions. The library is to maintain current services to selectives, but is not able to add new services.

The library building here outgrew its space in the 1980s. The building leaks with nearly every rain and has sewer and mold problems. It would be nice if Federal funding would be made available to help regional depositories construct new buildings.

Question 1-3 - Room for Collections UVA Library needs more space for all its physical collections. Our remote storage is full and we are investigating a more remote remote storage option. We hope to build a second local remote storage facility, but funding is not available at this time. Meanwhile, all collections, including the depository ones, continue to grow. In addition to these current space pressures our library is planning on a major renovation to reallocate space away from collections and to people – more collaborative spaces, more study spaces, more congregating space. This would impact the growth space for all collections, including the federal government documents. Question 4 - Computers for public We do have enough computers for both our primary clientele AND the general public to use for research and accessing government information. However, we have recently required an ID from all members of the general public when using our computers. We continue to refine our policies and procedures for computer access to the general public - making sure it allows research and academic access without encouraging recreational computing. Question 5-7 - Staffing Twenty years ago the "documents" collection had a staff of two professional librarians and three and a half support staff. Now the

staff is two librarians and six support staff, but the responsibilities have expanded to include continuing education, periodicals, microforms, cataloging, Google book project support, technology, and general reference. The staff is spread thinner and the expertise is not as deep. Student workers are expected to provide general humanities and social science reference assistance as well as government information assistance. So, while we do have enough staff to serve the collections and provide service, those same staff are expected to do many things and they are unable to develop a deep expertise in government information.

Question 8 - Regional staffing The primary person providing services to Virginia selectives is the Regional Librarian. She is also head of the overall Humanities and Social Sciences reference operation and acting director of the Library for Humanities and Social Sciences. While the "acting director" position is temporary, the combination of head of both general reference and government information means that she might not devote as much time as other regional librarian to services to selectives. That said, we believe that Virginia selectives feel well served. The Regional Librarian attempts to visit each non-federal selective every 3 years or when there's a new depository coordinator. The Regional also holds annual meetings for Virginia selectives.

Question 12 - Online depository Reference staff at many of the UVA libraries are able to assist users with government information. Education Library staff can easily find the Digest of Education Statistics rather than sending users to government documents for the back files of this title. Staff in our data center (Scholars' Lab) often assist users with census and other government information.

Question 13 - Collection Management training Again, currently the primary person doing this work is the Regional Librarian who has additional local responsibilities.

Question 14 - Cost to be a depository continues to increase While staff to support continues to be a major expense, it is really the cost of storing the materials that is increasing. Shelf space is a commodity, and an increasingly scarce one. Many of our government documents are in remote storage, but this requires cataloging them. Such cataloging is costly.

Question 15 - Expand services At this time UVA isn't prepared or staffed to provide Virginia selectives with additional services. Our model is, to some extent, a "service on demand" model. If there's a specific need the Regional Librarian will visit a depository, or consult with a depository coordinator. Currently, there are not enough staff to offer much else.

Question 19 - cooperative efforts Undoubtedly the VIVA (Virtual Library of Virginia) our statewide higher education library consortium has vastly increased our services to both students and the residents of Virginia. None of the members of VIVA would be able to purchase all the resources that the consortial buying enables us to afford. Nor would we be able to offer the training that VIVA makes available.

Question 21 - GPO consultants GPO consultants would allow Virginia depositories to reach more citizens by, potentially, offering workshops and training in government information sources to the general public as well as to depository staff. Most depositories in Virginia are academic institutions. While they acknowledge their wider responsibility to the general public, it is unarguable that their primary constituents are their students and faculty.

Question 22 - Discrepancy in public computing access So far, we have been able to continue to offer the general public doing research similar computer access to our students and faculty. However, we are committed to providing our students and faculty adequate computer access. Should network security concerns or concerns about recreational computing by the general public become overwhelming it might be that we would need to, in some way, more closely monitor computer use by the general public. We would always allow the true researcher access to a computer, but we might need to require registration of some sort.

Question 23 - Regional services Actually, in recent years we have funded depository visits and other travel by the Regional Librarian. We have also funded some aspects of the annual selective meeting.

Question 24 - Promoting depository The depository has always reached out to other Virginia libraries – both depository and non-depository. We provide educational programs at the annual Virginia Library Association meetings. We have not been strong in reaching out to business groups or individual citizens.

Question 25 - as virtual as possible Our library is moving toward becoming "as virtual as possible" in many of its collections areas. This trend for the depository collections would be consistent with our other collections.

General comments U.S. government information is much more widely available and accessible now than it was when the Depository Library Act of 1962 was passed. At that time slow delivery methods, no scanning or digital delivery technology, poor interlibrary loan turn around times, lack of bibliographic control for federal materials and similar issues argued for the presence of a full regional depository in every state. Now, the ubiquity of federal information on the internet, much better bibliographic control of federal documents, and much better delivery methods, both physical and digital, are able to deliver federal information to U.S. citizens in all parts of the country. The future of the federal depository system certainly will include tangible collections of federal documents spread across the country. Whether there is a need for 50 duplicated collections around the country is debatable. More flexibility in the depository law to allow collaborative regional arrangements, while ensuring every citizen has reasonable access to government information, is crucial.

1. Our space situation is somewhat different from other regional depositories. We have an agreement with the Readex corporation in which they borrow our documents to make their Government Publications microfiche product. As part of that agreement, we receive a free copy of the microfiche and use that to selectively weed the print collection (format substitution being permissible for depositories). While our current space will not be sufficient forever, it will serve for more than 5 years. Without the Readex agreement we would be in the same space predicament as other regionals.

2. Due to the above mentioned agreement with Readex, we probably have more fiche than other regionals. Readex provides us with the necessary cases to house the fiche, but we are out of appropriate places to put the cases.

6-8. There is enough professional and support staff to process incoming materials and to fill requests, but there is not enough staff to tackle special projects, such as retrospective cataloging, or to provide outreach to likely community audiences such as immigrants, legal firms or the local technical institute. We have no temporary staff. We could use more staff to process

discard lists. I think the selectives do not feel we do this in a timely manner. Public access would be enhanced by spreading documents expertise more widely among the professional staff. 9. The current geographic arrangement for this regional and its selectives is very workable. I can reasonably travel to any of the selectives in a one day trip, and – if necessary – patrons can reasonably travel here in one day. There is also plenty of public transportation to this location. The number of selectives we serve, 27, is also a reasonable number. It might be difficult for us to serve more selectives, particularly in regard to processing discard lists, or if over-night travel were required. 10-11. There is room for improvement, however. 12. A fair portion of the increased number of questions, however, are really technical questions (how to access a .pdf, or navigate a database, for example) rather than questions about which government resource to use. There is still a strong demand for tangible materials in our particular community, as well. Using the online FDLP may involve printing something out for the patron, or reading a fact to him/her, rather than the patron using the resource directly. 15. It depends on the services requested. 21. It depends on what the consultant would do. 22. As a public library, the general public is our primary clientele. 23. Staffing shortages have increased the turn-around time on discard lists, which is very inconvenient for the selectives. 25. While space constraints call for some reliance on digital materials, most of the Library's collections are still a balance of "virtual" and tangible materials. The depository collection falls into line with this practice.

The concept of a shared depository would be viable for some regional depositories and should be an option. Such as between a couple of libraries or among a cadre of libraries. LSU Libraries has a long tradition of collecting federal and state documents. As a regional depository, we have a I with the other regional depository in the state as well as with the selective depositories.

With regard to question 25, we would not discard paper documents but would still become as virtual as possible. We are eager to see the legacy collection digitized. Also, we want to stress that we are firmly committed to the depository program.

Some questions in this survey are not well crafted and we had difficulty understanding what was being asked. This may result in some conclusions being suspect. Question 25 highlights the main theme of our concerns for the future. The University of Maryland Libraries would eagerly move to serving our repository role in a more or less completely digital environment that allowed for the transformation of the repository system that was created to serve a completely print world. The human and technological resources that we invest in supporting a regional depository are disproportionate to actual use of the collection when compared to other Library collections and services

Washington State Library is committed to continuing to have a strong regional depository. Many of our selective depositories would like more control of the format of publications they receive.

15. We were prepared to expand services if we can reallocate funds by forming with Kansas a joint regional collection. 17&18. University of Nebraska-Lincoln Libraries proposed a joint regional collection with Kansas so that we can continue in the program, improve services, while decreasing costs. We spend \$634,400 from our budget per year to support the Regional Depository Library Program. This figure includes no Federal funds. Costs include salaries (5.25 FTE), equipment, supplies of \$244,400 and cost to shelve and maintain the collection of legacy print of over 130,000 items at \$390,000 per year. Staffing was decreased in the past two years due to overall budget cuts.

Row 1 - The space that over half of the collection, more than one million publications, occupies is slated to be converted into a computer technology center sometime in 2009. Rows 8,23,26 - Colorado is fortunate to have two long time regionals within 30 miles of each other. Colorado University in Boulder has been the senior partner and driving force in the Colorado depository system since Tim Byrne first established the Colorado Government Publications Interest Group (GoPIG) years ago. At one time half of the selective's discard lists went to DPL and half went to CU but in the age of the internet it was decided that it would be more efficient to centralize discard lists through CU. DPL has done it's smaller part by being a very large GPO collection, in generally very good condition, that the Denver metropolitan area has relatively easy access to. Rows 11,12 - This is a mixed bag or double-edged sword. Take your pick. We can do more with faster access because so many newer items are online but it also means that people with computers at home or office can also have access to them without having to go to the library. That combined with the general uses of a public library means that our collection is therefore not heavily used. Row 26 - This is the big one. DPL is still weighing the options on this very important decision.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) is a large Academic Research Library, currently ranked 17th* in the nation by the Association for Research Libraries (ARL). We have served as a Federal Depository since 1884 and as a Regional Federal Depository since 1963. While the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) has undergone significant changes, the underlying rationale – providing permanent public access to federal government documents - has not. We strongly support the continuation of the FDLP but applaud the documents community and GPO for utilizing whatever flexibility can be mined from Title 44 to adapt to the current environment while accomplishing this main goal of the program. Libraries of all types are facing many of the same challenges – funding, reallocation of space, doing more with less staff, and providing service beyond our physical boundaries. In addressing these challenges, libraries are increasingly working together in collaborative endeavors that seek not to diminish our service but to continue and often enhance what we do for our patrons. To that end, we fully support formal collaborative partnerships such as the Kansas/Nebraska shared regional proposal. We also support joint efforts to: retrospectively catalog older government documents, strengthen interlibrary loan service, digitize and make freely available government documents, identify expertise within the documents community for training and reference as well as ascertain the most complete collections for specific government agencies. Whether these collaborations are intra or inter state is irrelevant to the end goal of providing permanent public access to government documents. What is relevant and indeed very necessary is Congressional support for such collaboration among all federal depositories whether that means permitting creative and flexible, but legal, reading of Title 44 or minor tweaks that update the FLDP for its second centennial of service, which begins in 2013. *As of 2005-2006, this is the latest year available from ARL.

As the Director of the IN State Library I strongly support and I am committed to our role as the Regional Depository. Our budget has gone up, unlike most states. We are inputting our pre 1976 fed docs in our online catalog and use Marcive for 1976 to current. We have several librarians with a strong knowledge of fed docs and I have taught the course twice at the IN Univ School of Lib and INfo Science. We are going out to colleges and universities to talk about gov docs and increasing their visibility with exhibits and workshops. Roberta Brooker State Librarian Indiana State Library.

The budgetary support of our state library, including federal documents, has taken a downturn in the past couple of years and we expect it to continue for a few more years. We have moved non-depository collections back into this building, but moved part of our depository collection to remote storage. We have cut staff in all parts of the library, including documents, although we are periodically able to hire contract workers or interns to help with projects. We support the selective depository libraries as much as we can, although we are not able to schedule regular on-site visits. In addressing these facts, we have looked at other ways to do our work and make it meaningful. We house some of our documents (Congressional hearings) in acid-free records boxes to maximize space, we have trained almost all staff in documents work so they are able to provide initial assistance to people, and we have found teleconferencing and “Live Classroom” software as a help to have group discussions with selective depository librarians. During periods of budget cuts, such as the one we are in, the documents area is often better supported than other collections which are getting very few new materials. The efforts of the current leadership and staff in the State Library have allowed the depository to continue moving forward. This emphasis on the value of federal documents may not be duplicated in future years as people move on to new positions. Cuts in our agency budget may also affect our ability to continue as a depository in future years, and we consider this situation periodically. All areas of library information have been altered by technology except Title 44, which is almost 60 years out-of-date. Technology offers the potential for improved access through digitizing copies of government publications and lowers the need to retain multiple formats, and encourages the indexing and cataloging of regional collections. We support the need to update the Regional program. Specifically, we support the inclusion of shared regionals such as the one proposed by Kansas and Nebraska. The current structure of the depository system needs to be more flexible to allow selective depositories to continue conducting business to benefit their users. The role of the regional to provide oversight and approval is helpful and limiting. If a state were to lose their regional depository, the selectives would be adversely affected and each would be required to retain all materials “forever.” Support for selective depositories may be better satisfied on a multi-state perspective and look to the regional depositories as facilitators of the good work of selectives. There can be no meaningful budgetary defense of print duplicative legacy collections which are often held in prime library real estate. They are underused, costly to store and not indexed in a fashion that the society within which we operate understands or values.

The University of Colorado at Boulder will submit additional comments via the open comment page.

Director's responses.

Q. 16 & 17 Changes in both depository library services and collections have, and continue to lag behind development of digital services and collections in the academic library environment. The following are areas of significant concern: 1) Lack of common/similar interfaces for resource discovery, preferably that span all government agencies. 2) Lack of reliability/stability (durable URLs) of resources. 3) Lack of adherence to standards (e.g. Open URL) that allow relatively seamless linking to and from documents. 4) Lack of downloadable usage data. 5) Lack of complete downloadable MARC record sets for e-documents.

Regional depository services, around the nation, have always been of uneven quantity and quality. This is due not only to funding inequalities, but also to the uneven numbers of selectives served and geographical areas covered. For example, California has one regional and 90 selectives; a few states with smaller populations and many fewer selectives (New Mexico, Oklahoma, South Carolina) have two regionals; some states have no regionals. So the portion of the 1962 Depository Library Act which authorizes and enables regional depositories has always enjoyed mixed success. If Title 44 could somehow be revised to address this inequality of regional services, both regional and selective service to the public would be enhanced. In addition to this core deficiency, the 1962 Depository Library Act was written for library and information services as they existed forty-six years ago, when the Internet, comprehensive electronic libraries, and instantaneous electronic delivery of information were the dreams of science fiction. Because electronic library services and information delivery systems have resulted in decreased emphasis on physical collections, the costs of being a regional (under the terms of the 1962 law) are increasingly becoming an unfunded mandate. Regionals are charged, by law, with permanently housing comprehensive physical collections that are the property of the U.S. government. In 1962, these collection maintenance costs were mitigated by the free receipt of depository materials that regionals would have purchased with local funds—had they not been regionals. Now that tangible receipts have dwindled (yet the responsibility remains of permanently maintaining a heritage collection that belongs to the U.S. government), it is becoming increasingly difficult for the administrators of regionals to balance benefit to cost. If the U.S. government were to appropriate money to pay regionals for housing these collections, the benefit to cost balance would be at least partially restored.

Comments on Questions 1-3 Responses: We chose to answer in neutral because the reality is not that libraries COULD not have sufficient space for housing Federal depository collections (print, microfiche, or electronic), but rather that there are many competing needs for spaces and resources to support other collections, staff and for users. As well, we concur with the University of Florida comments that although we MAY have enough space in our remote storage facility to house the FDLP collections, there are additional challenges involved. Even given the possibility of provided cataloging records for pre-1976 materials, the LOCAL costs to process legacy collections for adequate reflection in OPAC's and remote storage (estimated at \$5.00 per piece) are very high (given the number of legacy collection items), and therefore a significant challenge for all Regional institutions. We also strongly believe, and would support, digitization of existing legacy collections in manner that would enhance an Open Access environment for these materials. Comment on Questions 5, 6, & 7: Although we may have 'enough' staff to sustain FDLP operations in our institution at current operational levels - we may not be able to adequately develop, promote, and sustain the kinds of services needed to adequately support users in accessing U.S. Government Information. Although much U.S. Government Information is readily accessible electronically, and more so as we move forward in time; the skills and expertise in aiding user's access to this information (and therefore supporting library staff at to effectively aid users) is a critical challenge - and one that takes resources to undertake. Comment on Question 9: We strongly agree and support the idea of providing support in neighboring states. This is at the heart of our (KS and NE) collaborative Regional proposal. Comment on Question 11: Our most heavily used materials from FDLP collections include soil surveys, Census, NASA, State, and Congressional materials. These areas fit most strongly with our own institutions programmatic areas. However, as a Research One Institution, all areas of FDLP materials are potentially relevant and we would wish for a coordinated system that supports universal access to the entire range of FDLP materials. And, the collections would be even more widely used if digitized. Comment on Question 14: In same fashion that University of Nebraska has done to document the 'costs' of being a Regional Library, we have determined that we are spending roughly \$80,000/year for services to provide intellectual access to FDLP and U.S. Government Information materials (abstracting/indexing, cataloging, full-text); roughly \$800,000/year to house tangible FDLP materials, and almost \$200,000/year for staff support, information technology, and other supplies. This comes to a total of \$1,092,459.10 a year in local institutional resources devoted to FDLP and other U.S. government information resources. Comment on Question 21: We could be interested in GPO Consultants. It would depend on what services, and supports a consultant's program was set up to provide to an FDLP Region. Comment on Question 23: We would not say that we have intentionally engaged in a recision of regional services to selectives, but rather that like all libraries, we are faced with the demands to do more for all users without a concurrent increase in resources (fiscal for staffing, content, spaces, services) to do so. Comment on Question 26: As an academic library we remain strongly committed to the ideal of public access to government information, and to the Federal Depository Library Program. That being said, should the requirements (and the draw on local fiscal and other finite resources) of continuing as a Regional become too difficult to maintain, or have a negative impact on other institutional needs, we would have to

seriously question continuation as a Regional Library with the FDLP. As well, as Selective Libraries may choose to weed their existing collections, select fewer tangible items in the future, or choose to leave the FDLP entirely, all of these choices will place increasing pressure on Regionals to support their Selectives in de-accessioning and as 'Collections of Last Resort' for their respective regions. Comment on potential future for the FDLP, Regional, and Selective Libraries within the program: We strongly believe that a compelling future exists in a more collaborative system of FDLP libraries that work together to share resources for training and support of public use for government information. This vision is also true for the digitization, and metadata creation, for existing legacy collections and new information formats of government information as we may see in the future. Overall comment on survey: We strongly concur with the comments housed by the University of Florida (Depository # 0103) as speaking to the current situation for Regional Depositories within the FDLP. Overall comment on survey: As other Regional institutions have commented, a more detailed, deliberative, and more comprehensive examination of the FDLP System, partner libraries, and pressures on system, would seem warranted. This would not be possible by the June 1, 2008 deadline JCP has established, but may be something to factor into the response to JCP.

We would like to amplify our answers to the following questions: Questions #1-2 – Growth space for print and microform collections of any kind is limited. For every new book we acquire, one must be eliminated or stored. As a Regional, the inability to engage in cooperative storage within and beyond the state is a serious problem. We must find new strategies for Regionals to participate in shared print collections. Question #3 – (space for CDs) It will be important going forward to ensure that a new Regional system will allow for the retention of a title in only one format, including online. A big step in that direction would be the revival of GPO's CD migration project. If all of the CDs we currently house in each Regional could be moved to a web-based format, this space issue would be resolved, and would allow our users to get to that information online. Allowing more online substitution could also relieve some pressure on our paper and fiche collections. Question #4 (computer access for users) and #25 (our desire to be as "virtual" as possible). Going forward, we would welcome more clarity in anticipated machine and system requirements regarding GPO requests for Regionals to store online files locally. Sudden changes in this environment result in capital expenses at the local level that cannot be addressed quickly, essentially becoming unfunded mandates. While GPO has not insisted that all Regionals assist in this storage effort up to this point, the time is coming when the issue of back-ups for government-held copies of these electronic files will have to be addressed or risk loss of information. If Regionals are to play a part in this effort, there will need to be more consultation and pre-planning for the systems component of such a commitment between Regionals and GPO. The source of funding to support such new investments is far from assured. Questions #5-7 – All types of staff have been reduced in our library system. For next year, we are losing 7 additional positions as a result of budget reductions of 6% in state support. We can sustain our current operation but future reductions may cause us to reconsider our status as a Regional depository. Question #8 – Our staff do an admirable job of training and supporting our Selective libraries. However, travel funds are limited both for the Selectives to come to us and for us to go to them. Questions #9 and #17 – Our answers to these questions might be different if we could be sure that a more flexible operating environment for Regionals is on the horizon. We would be willing to consider serving more than one state in a more flexible, collaborative Regional depository system that allows for more targeted collection responsibilities among a group of libraries who could share responsibility for cataloging, preserving, digitizing and providing access to a complete Regional depository legacy collection. Question #12 – Improved online access has enabled us to serve more users by phone or email rather than asking them to come to campus to use tangible materials. Questions #14 and #17 – The concept of shared Regionals is essential to our future. All Regional libraries share the same mission to provide the best possible service to the Selectives in their region, and to the public at large. The information paradigm for all libraries has shifted to more digital access, and toward more cooperative resources and services. The Regional depositories need the ability to pursue the same collaborative approach, at the same level, as their institutional libraries are pursuing. Questions #14 and #20— Kentucky libraries, depending on where their state funding is coming from, are facing budget reductions of anywhere from 6-15% in each of the next two years. Question #18 – A static budget would be a welcome one. Instead our budget is declining. Where possible, we have mainstreamed government documents processes for efficiency. Questions #19 and #21 –Our answers to these questions demonstrate the directions we would like to see a new system move: allow more collaboration among libraries, and create more participation incentives for the remaining Regionals or Regional consortia. The amount of tangible information products received by Regionals is no longer an adequate incentive to stay in the program. Thus, GPO needs to find other "carrots" that will be valuable enough in our new online information world to keep Regionals interested in participating. For example, financial assistance with cataloging and digitizing our pre-1976 holdings would be a major incentive for Regionals to retain their current status within the FDLP. Question #26 – Libraries are rapidly changing and evolving their services to remain relevant in the 21st century. If GPO and the JCP do not encourage and permit new models of service, we will be forced to consider whether we can continue serving as a Regional depository.

We have enjoyed and benefited from serving as the Regional for Connecticut and Rhode Island for many years.

Not all regional depositories are in dire straits. As in all libraries generally, there are varying levels of support and funding. While library funding may be limited, the federal regional depository at the Texas State Library and Archives Commission receives committed support. The depository is considered a valued resource for the citizens of Texas. The depository's strengths include: * Knowledgeable documents staff * Reference assistance to patrons statewide and nationally * Documents holdings records loaded into OPAC * Disposal/discard lists for all Texas selectives are processed monthly * Continually enhancing our historical collection by purchases, and by reviewing discard lists and a "needs" file * Space to keep the collection onsite * ILL and resource sharing through a statewide courier service * Computers upgraded as needed to meet GPO minimum requirements Areas for public access improvement: * Additional funding for materials supporting the documents collection * Funding for training for selective depository librarians and staff (or training materials and resources provided by GPO) * Retrospective cataloging of documents collection; would like funding or assistance from GPO Other long term issues/considerations: * The importance of regional depository historical collections, especially as selectives downsize their collections * The importance of stable digital access; limited server downtime; permanent access; authentication of electronic documents * Housing electronic documents on local servers * GPO coordinating training for depositories, and providing timely promotional materials.

Comments to GPO survey of regional depositories 4/29/08 Question 1. Space may be adequate when our remote storage facility becomes available next year, although many of the materials which would be most suitable for remote storage are not yet cataloged. I welcome the recent announcement that regionals and some selectives will cooperate to catalog pre-1976 materials. We would like to see GPO do some of the cataloging or provide funding for cataloging of pre-1976 docs. Question 2. Our library will be undergoing continued significant renovation and it is possible that microfiche materials will have to be moved or space for them reduced. We are reluctant to move uncataloged microfiche to remote storage. Questions 5 and 6. Like most other regionals our library spends a significant amount of time processing discard lists and trying to find homes for materials that we believe should not be discarded that we ourselves do not need. Our time is spent making space, processing discards, reviewing discard lists, and doing reference. We do not have much time for face-to-face outreach, nor to do much planning to coordinate collections or become a light archive for the state or regional, although we would welcome staff and time to pursue these initiatives. Question 11. Our historical (i.e., pre-1976) materials are in many cases used more frequently than recent materials. Questions 15, 21, and 25. Our library is not prepared to expand services to our region, although we believe that should be our goal. We would like to serve as a light archive similar to the Indiana model, and perhaps even to serve with another regional such as the Connecticut State Library or University of Maine as one of two light archives in New England. We see the value of retaining print resources (mostly in a light or dark archive) while at the same time becoming as virtual as possible. Historically BPL has been a weaker regional compared to many others. The Boston Library Consortium responded to GPO's request several years ago and forwarded a proposal to place a consultant in our state, who could help the regional as well as the selectives deal with technical services and provide training to us to help non-documents librarians throughout the state provide wider access to government documents. Funding for the consultant program was scratched, much to my dismay, so we did not get a consultant at what I believe was a critical time in our life as a regional. I obviously cannot say if services would improve if a consultant we placed here, but my institution seriously needs guidance on how best to spend our limited resources and to become as cost-efficient regional as is possible. Gail Fithian Curator of Government Documents Boston Public Library 700 Boylston Street Boston, MA 02116 (617) 859-2226 FAX (617) 859-2292

Question 1. Until 2004 Michigan was served by two regional depository libraries. Since the Detroit Public Library has relinquished their regional status in favor of selective library status, the Library of Michigan has sole responsibility for the permanent retention of tangible government publications in the state. The Detroit Public Library is systematically divesting itself of large portions of its collection. Given these circumstances, we can no longer predict the point at which we will run out of space for print publications. Question 9. Not under the current requirements. We currently attempt to serve Michigan depositories with training and occasional visits as well as interlibrary loan and disposal services. Like most state libraries, we could not fund travel across state lines to provide such services. We would be very interested in working *with* other states in a cooperative manner, such as outlined in the rejected Kansas-Nebraska proposal, should such arrangements be legally permitted. Question 15. We have expanded services to the extent we are able given the departure of the Detroit Public Library as a regional library. We are not able to serve Michigan libraries to the same level we were able to prior to 2004. Question 23. Budgetary constraints statewide led the Detroit Public Library to relinquish regional status. Those same budget constraints continue to limit the activities of the Library of Michigan, and make it impossible to fill the void. General comments: We remain very concerned for the integrity of the historical federal documents collection within the state of Michigan. Our concern is a result of becoming the sole regional serving 43 depositories over a very large service area, made more difficult by the complete lack of a process for us and the Detroit Public Library to follow.

Rationale for Survey Responses: Questions 1-3 (space): Depository items are currently housed in several buildings on campus: Gorgas Library, Rogers Science and Engineering Library, Bruno Business Library, McLure Education Library, University Map Library (administered by the Geography Department), and the Libraries' Annex. It is unclear whether or not we are running out of space to house the depository collection – we are currently removing more items from the collection than we are adding. However, the trend in libraries is to devote more space to users than to collections, so a “repurposing” of the space currently occupied by the depository collection in Gorgas Library could happen. Space is not just a concern for the depository collection – we are out of space in the Libraries as a whole. We estimate that we have at least 800,000 pre-1976 documents which are not cataloged. To copy catalog, barcode and process these in-house would cost at least \$4,000,000. This is a substantial amount of money and would not be possible at the current time given the restrictions on our budget. Questions 4, 22 (electronic access): Although wireless Internet access is restricted to those affiliated with the University, there are 30 public computers in Gorgas Library available for campus visitors interested in accessing government information. Licensed electronic resources are available remotely for the University community, and to anyone who wants to use them within the confines of the Library. Questions 5-8 (staffing): Current staffing: • Government Documents Unit of Gorgas Public Services -- 1 professional librarian -- 2 Library Assistants -- 6 student assistants • Cataloging and Metadata Services Department -- Library Assistant III (serials; half-time) -- Library Assistant II (monographs; full-time) -- 1 student assistant In previous semesters we have had interns from the School of Library and Information Studies. Student employment has fluctuated. The current staffing situation is adequate for our current operations/projects. If we want to expand services and take on additional projects in the near future, we will need more – particularly in cataloging. Questions 14, 18, 20, 23 (budget/funding): The administration has supported and funded travel for the Regional librarian to visit selective depositories and to attend meetings of the Federal Depository Library Council to the Public Printer. We have also been able to host a meeting of depository librarians and staff from around the state – the 2nd time ever that this has happened. Government Documents has a separate collections budget, intended for the purchase of materials to supplement the depository collection. We also have purchased/subscribe to some key electronic products, including the LexisNexis Congressional Serial Set and HeinOnline. Creating an atmosphere where collaboration on projects such as cataloging, digitizing or providing shared access to collections would be welcome. The state of Alabama's budget outlook for higher education is grim, and we are uncertain as to what our budget situation will be like for the next few years. Questions 8, 13, 15 (services to selectives): Service to selective depositories is a top priority of this Regional depository. Within the past year the depository librarian has: • established a web site with information specifically for selective depositories in Alabama • established a discussion list for depositories (ALDOCS) • collaborated with the other Regional, at Auburn University Montgomery, to streamline the process of handling disposal lists in the state • visited seven selective depositories in Region 1 of the state (the Region served by UA) Other services we provide: • Lend documents via Interlibrary Loan • Try to provide replacement materials (photocopies, copies of CDs, etc.) if a selective has lost or is missing an item • Answer reference questions, questions re: depository management via phone, email, Instant Messenger Future services: We are currently surveying selective depository staff in Alabama as to their training needs, as well as their overall expectations of the Regional depositories. Once these results have been analyzed, we will be able to tailor our services to meet their specific needs. Question 27 (cost of operating a Regional depository): The commitment to run a Regional depository is not insignificant. Our costs for the past year were \$273,000. This includes staff, travel, supporting materials and cataloging. Running a Regional Depository must be integrated with other library priorities such as the increasing pressure to add electronic resources to our overall collections, the need to reallocate limited space for user's, and the uncertainty about state funding for higher education. The benefits of being a Regional Depository are many; however, it would be to everyone's advantage to incorporate innovative ideas like the Kansas-Nebraska partnership into the GPO program. Providing access to materials in a digital format with the assurance of preservation and archiving will be vital for the future. This type of access will not only provide greater access of government materials to the public, but will also address several other issues such as space. Funding from GPO will be necessary to support this kind of initiative and must include funding for metadata creation, harvesting, outreach and training.

Questions 4 & 5 on sufficient professional/support staff: UNM is able to provide only 1 professional librarian dedicated to the overarching responsibilities that are required for Regional participation. There are only 2 Regional Libraries in New Mexico, who split their administrative duties and provide adequate coverage to the state's 9 selective depositories. UNM serves the majority of the depository library users in the state. UNM currently employs one support staff person who has responsibility for processing and shelving/interfiling all depository shipments received (GPO, loose mail, maps, and other materials disseminated). The support person also assists the Regional Librarian in training, resolving complex reference questions and the production of the state's newsletter. There are also two student assistants who spend 50% of their time assisting in the processing. Two student assistants also spend 50% of their time shelving/interfiling microfiche. UNM also has a full time employee responsible for the Map Library located in a separate location from the regional library collection. This person is not involved in the processing of depository maps (the exception being the shelving of maps received) but does provide quality reference services to all users of the map collection. This current staffing is insufficient, with dedicated new positions unlikely. A new model of distributing the workload across regionals, including other states, is needed. Question 14: Financial Support Like other institutions, internal financial support for the Regional has decreased

significantly over the past several years. Because of overall library budget constraints, activities and projects such as retrospective (e.g., pre-1976) cataloging, collaboration efforts with regional libraries in other states, travel to state selective depositories, and other projects have been decreased or curtailed. The recent opinion of the JCP will negatively impact our collaboration efforts that have been in the early planning states with inter- and intra-state regionals. Unless cooperative financial support is forthcoming from GPO or another federal entity, our abilities to maintain regional commitments will be strained further. Question 26: Relinquishing regional depository status At the current moment, no, we are not entertaining this notion and would only do so under extreme circumstances. However, unstable funding coupled with the ever changing needs of our many constituents, necessitate that a yearly assessment of our continued participation be conducted. The JCP should recognize the potential of the shared regional concept and how important it is for border-states to participate in order to continue to provide no-fee, unfettered access to federal government information. Although the UNM UL will continue to actively support and participate in sponsored projects such as the GWLA Digitization Project, GPO's Web Harvesting Initiative and other projects where grant funds are available, it becomes increasingly challenging to justify to the Provost and President of UNM the need to remain a regional depository. In an era of rapidly evolving technologies coupled with the ever-changing needs of our primary constituents, the continued commitment to a system last changed more than 40 years ago is increasingly difficult to maintain.

The Oregon State Library is the Federal Depository Library Program's newest Regional depository. In light of declining Regional services in Oregon, the State Library stepped forward to provide leadership for the depository libraries in the state in 2007. In agreeing to serve as the State's Regional, the State Library entered into a partnership with three of the State's largest selective depositories to house and provides services in conjunction with Oregon's Regional Depository Collection. Regional management and outreach responsibilities remain with the State Library. We feel that Oregon's innovative partnership has addressed many of the "challenges" to Regional depository libraries implied in this survey. We suggest that a description of Oregon's challenges and solutions would serve as helpful case study for the report to the Joint Committee on Printing, since it offers an alternative to the existing model of Regional services within the current statutory requirements. We would be happy to provide GPO with any additional information needed to create a case study for the report.

3. Tangible electronic publications is a case of unprofessional direction. 27. The highest priority for the GPO is to choose the series that need to be digitized. Cataloging is a waste of time and money. Digitization is the activity that has the greatest merit. In an increasingly electronic environment, what does it mean to be a depository library?-not much, if anything. The libraries foot the bill; GPO generates additional costs. A poor model. The public's use of Federal documents in our library is largely a myth.

1. GPO needs to move more aggressively to digitally archiving federal documents so that access is centralized, especially for high-use publications. 2. Regional depositories should move towards sharing collections and even service responsibilities with other regional and even selective depositories both intra- and inter-state. 3. Interlibrary lending of documents among regional depositories should be encouraged so that not all collections need to maintain holdings of all tangible documents. 4. The University of Hawaii at Manoa regional depository lost 95+% of its holdings in an October 2004 flood. The Library will not be able to replace all that was lost nor will it be able to process all replacement documents already received as gifts. 5. Like other university libraries, UH Manoa Library must place increasing emphasis on allocating resources for space, processing, and services to locally significant heritage collections and heavily used materials. At the same time we are repurposing library space for users rather than storage of collections. We cannot afford space for the large number of tangible documents that are not used. 6. Library resources available to allocate to federal government documents may not be sufficient to maintain a regional depository in the future. 7. Allow regional depositories to discard items not relevant to their local clientele, e.g. documents specific to other states with no informational value to a broader audience. 8. GPO needs statutory authority to give grants to regional depositories to do training and site visits to their selective depositories. 9. Resource sharing is the modern approach to library collections. A new system of several full depository service centers in each region (North, South, East, West) should be sufficient if funding is provided to those service centers to provide services to their neighboring states and territories. Existing regional depositories could then elect to become selective depositories with the materials they know their local clientele need the most.

Question #1 asks about space. Our most critical space problem is not necessarily for new materials shipped by GPO, but rather to store unprocessed legacy/historical documents that come to us from Missouri selective depository libraries. The FDLP system makes Regional depositories responsible for building and preserving tangible legacy government collections. The legacy collection is built by taking historic materials being weeded by selectives. Presently we have about 150 shelves of unprocessed documents in public areas because our storage rooms for unprocessed documents are filled

to capacity. We normally wouldn't have this much, but in the last couple years, two selective libraries in our state dropped their FDLP status. When a library drops its status, they must relinquish their government holdings to the regional. An increasing number of selective depositories have been dropping their FDLP status due to space considerations, and we wouldn't be surprised if a few more drop FDLP status over the next 10 years. A tremendous backlog caused by staff shortages is making it difficult for us to move unprocessed documents out of our public areas. The storage space problem is mitigated by the fact that due to decreased staff in the Docs office, we don't have time to check discard lists from other states. This is unfortunate because out-of-state libraries are typically the best source for Missouri materials which are lightly used and in good condition. Question #8 asks whether we have sufficient staff to support regional responsibilities to selectives. With one professional and one support staff person, we have only enough to fulfill the barest minimum. One of the traditional responsibilities has been for the Regional librarian to visit selective libraries in the region, review procedures, offer training, and provide advocacy for administrative support. We have 29 selectives. It would be impossible to visit all of them on a regular basis without neglecting our own needs at MU. Question #15 asks whether I am prepared to expand services to selective libraries. I am prepared to expand in whatever area my selectives demand, but it would mean dropping other projects. I'm not sure if this constitutes real expansion. Question #17 asks whether changes in depository library collections have been consistent with changes in other library services. One important difference is that electronic information from the government is outpacing that from private publishers. Yet the need for documents reference service is not decreasing. A great deal of government information is in the "Deep Web" and one must know the gateways – DOE Information Bridge, STINET, DTIC, Energy Citations Database, etc. in order to find it. Second, few documents questions are searches for known items. Sometimes we hear "Do you have this particular document?" But far more often we are asked which government document holds the answer to a question. To answer such a question, good knowledge of the collection is required. Third, because we still have vast numbers of documents not yet represented in our online catalog, public services staff are still needed to show users paper indexes such as the Monthly Catalog of United States Government Publications (1893-1996) and Pooles's Checklist (1789-1909), and then to show them how to use the Documents card files to determine whether we own a particular item.

Question 1. Space for print collections would be sufficient with the utilization of our remote storage facility, but deposit of documents is inhibited by the fact that this collection is not cataloged. Even when GPO provides cataloging records for the pre-1976 material through the shelf list digitization project, the cost of processing the collection will be substantial. We estimate that it would cost approximately \$4,000,000 to copy catalog and bar code our collection of approximately 800,000 pre-1976 documents. Questions 2 & 3. Space within our existing building does not allow for additional cabinets to house microfiche or tangible electronic products produced by GPO. We continue to purchase auxiliary commercial microfiche products to enhance our collection, further limiting our space. Questions 5, 6 & 7. The term "enough" is relative and subject to interpretation. We have adequate professional staff (2.5 FTE), support staff (5.5 FTE), and temporary staff (6 FTE) to sustain the operation, but not "enough" staff to provide the level of support to our constituents that they would like to have. Question 8. While I believe that our selective depository libraries would rank us among the strongest regionals, we are not able to support them as much as they (and we) would like. Travel funds are limited, both for the selectives to come to us and for us to go to their locations. Question 9. We are already serving as a regional library for two territories and have served as a regional for a contiguous state on an interim basis in the past. Question 11. Among the most heavily used materials are soil surveys, census data, and costal materials, as well as NASA, Smithsonian and Congressional publications. Question 12. Improved online access has enabled us to serve more users through phone and e-mail. We can more effectively answer phone and email requests for information and materials by directing users to the online sources rather than asking them to come into the library to use tangible materials. Question 14. Libraries today are all about collaboration and avoiding duplication. They are putting their resources into the digitization and cataloging of their unique (or relatively unique) materials to make them more accessible and visible. They are eliminating or moving to storage little used collections to increase user space. Government documents are not going to get the priority for scarce internal dollars unless it is an investment in recovery of space -- which means addressing cataloging, substitution rules and increased flexibility about establishing truly regional collections. Our library could become a light archive for print for the SE. We would willingly take on responsibility for a larger region if there is a source of funding. Question 15. We would consider providing additional services requested by our selective depository libraries, but our ability to provide such services is dependent on funding, so Federal support needs to be considered. Question 25. While we value and will continue to take advantage of the online resources, we are committed to maintaining a print collection for primary clientele and for the selectives we serve. Question 27. GENERAL COMMENTS: The regional depository libraries are self-funded, voluntary participants in the FDLP and they play a crucial critical role in the program. Allowing them more flexibility for collaboration in the management of regional collections and services is essential. Innovative ideas like the Kansas-Nebraska partnership should be encouraged. I am glad that GPO and JCP are undertaking this study. I hope this is the beginning of a dialog that will lead to constructive changes. The FDLP needs room for innovation and experimentation in order to thrive. As a regional depository library, we are experiencing a drastic increase in disposition lists, reflecting the pressure on our selectives to better manage their print collections and allocate space within their libraries for users and more heavily used collections. This increases their reliance on the regional library collection and services. With their collections diminishing, it is more critical than ever that we provide accurate holdings for our own collection, and that can only be accomplished through a massive cataloging and processing effort. Such an effort would also facilitate greater

collaboration with other depository libraries not within our current regional responsibilities. While the probability of Federal funding is extremely low, the urgent need for some funding for current regional depository libraries or new regional centers needs to be clearly articulated in the report to JCP. The days when the benefits of regional designation offset the costs are going away rapidly and for some may already be gone. Our annual costs for serving as a regional are \$437,039. This includes \$292,000 for professional and support staff. The balance is for temporary staff (student assistants) and operating expenses, such as services, equipment, travel and acquisition of commercial information products. It does not include the University's costs for space, building maintenance, utilities, etc. If federal funding became available for establishing 7 to 10 regional print repositories, including cataloging/inventorying those collections, there would probably be competition among existing regional libraries to serve in this new capacity. Our library would certainly be interested. Access to a comprehensive digital collection would greatly improve public access and make it feasible to operate a smaller number of regional print repositories. Such an initiative would need to provide for the availability of high quality images with searchable text, authenticated to assure validity, and supported by a robust system for retrieval and preservation/migration. The FDLP needs adequate funding for the new system and for other services such as harvesting and cataloging Federal publications from agency websites, digitization, and storage, as well as increased outreach and training. These are new or expanded requirements brought about by the changing environment that cannot be accomplished with the currently available funds.

Comments on specific questions: 1-2 The University is currently planning to build off-site storage. Assuming this happens within the next year, space for housing these collections will be fine but without this additional space, it will not be. Even with this space, the burden of the cataloging and barcoding needed to utilize the off-site storage for these print and microform government collections is daunting. 8. Iowa only has 13 selective depositories and many of them are questioning the value of continuing this commitment. As a result, we are constantly processing lists of items they no longer want to house so they can rely even more on the regional for housing these materials and the supporting services. This is placing a serious additional burden on the regionals. In addition, because so many of these selective depositories in Iowa are small libraries with very limited staff, they are increasingly looking to our library staff to develop and provide standard convenience tools for their users. 9. Under the current agreements with regionals, our library would not consider this additional responsibility. However, assuming a more up-to-date system for providing government information, we might be willing to consider some alternative, depending on how it is structured. 11. While not "frequently" used, the tangible collection is used. It is often the very old materials from the tangible collection that get the most use but our users would love to see this material in digital format. 21. I would need a clearer sense of what role such consultants would play before I could endorse the idea. 26. We have not actively considered relinquishing our regional status since there is no other library in Iowa capable or willing to assume this role. However, there clearly is no longer a need to have 50+ regional depository libraries. We are eager to see some more up-to-date system established. We might consider giving up this commitment or even assuming an additional commitment if some more practical, forward-looking alternative to the current program were established. Overall comment: The depository system is based on 40+ year old print-based realities that have changed dramatically in the last decade. It is not surprising that so many libraries, especially the selectives, are questioning their commitments to a depository system that is so antiquated, inflexible, and expensive to maintain. It is time that the whole system were re-examined and updated to reflect an increasingly digital environment, offering new options for delivery of information. All the existing regional libraries should not need to continue to house the same collections around the country at considerable institutional expense. This should be an excellent time for GPO to be able to experiment with new models (such as the one proposed by Kansas and Nebraska as well as other alternatives). We should be experimenting with new collaborative alternatives that are more consistent with user needs, financial realities, and digital capabilities. These alternative could help us all determine the best models for providing government information freely to the public in a way that is manageable for the libraries, effective for the user, and fiscally responsible to the tax-paying public.

Wisconsin is an excellent example that each regional depository is unique. It is uncertain if Wisconsin would have a regional depository today without this flexibility. The shared status employed here over the years has allowed us to manage the responsibilities of the depository by taking advantage of resources and staff expertise across campus. And, by distributing specific segments of the collection to campus libraries specializing in that given subject area, we are also better able to provide high-quality services to faculty, students and the general public. The FDLP needs to support innovation, experimentation and collaboration in and among regional repositories. As a Library Partner in Google's Book Search Project Wisconsin is actively digitizing federal government documents. This will greatly improve public access to federal government documents. Digitization projects such as these allow for a repurposing of library space to meet the learning needs of today's faculty and students. Regional services that we've been providing include: Managing discard lists; loaning materials to selectives; advising libraries on depository guidelines, services, discarding, selection, staying in the program; attending depository library conferences and reporting back to selectives; sending reminders about participating in GPO surveys; reference assistance; and visits to selectives.

Questions 1-3 Space is not an issue in our library, the University Libraries has a high-density storage facility that has allowed for the transfer of nearly 125,000 items or 6,000+ linear feet of material. Material is currently being annexed at a rate of 2,000 items or 100 linear feet per month. Question 4 The library has made a significant investment in public access workstations and laptops for the use of students and the general public. Questions 5-7 There is currently enough staff, there will likely be some re-purposing of staff in the next fiscal year that should minimally affect depository operations. Support for electronic information resources and services is the area of most need. Question 8 The regional librarians (USC and Clemson) conduct an annual meeting for selective depository librarians. At that meeting the selectives are asked about their needs and offered training. Three site visits were conducted during the current year by the USC regional. Training and assistance is provided on request and is encouraged. The selectives are most interested in the ability to discard materials. Question 9 This would only be possible if there were some compensation or financial support from the institutions or GPO. There needs to be a more regional or consortial approach instead of the state by state arrangement. Many large academic libraries already work in this manner, i.e., in the Southeast there is the Association of Southeastern Research Libraries (ASERL) that also works closely with SOLINET (a regional affiliate of OCLC). Question 10 There approximately 10,000-15,000 questions annually. The Government Information/Microforms service desk is the 2nd busiest in the library system and is available 84 hours per week during the semester. Question 11 The tangible collection use has been steady over the last few years. The library is also actively adding titles to the collection from selective discards and through retrospective cataloging of the collection. Question 13 Yes, sessions would be conducted is requested by selective depository staff. Question 14 Support remains the same annually, the library is under constant pressure to add new services in an environment of minimal increases in the budget. Question 19 Being a member of the state and regional consortia expands the expertise of the staff and the value of the collections. This value would increase even more if retrospective or legacy collections were available. Federal depository Library Program needs to move towards a more consortial service model, including the development of shared reference services, shared collections, and creation of center of expertise. Question 20 The current economic situation does not look promising over the next 1-3 years; it might improve in years 4- 5. Question 21 The library is very much in favor of this concept. It would provide expertise to conduct training session for depository and non-depository library staff. Since 95% of the current material is available online the need to be a FDL to access government information resources is practically moot. The focus for the future should be access (to current and legacy collections) and training for librarians and library staff to identify and provide guidance to the resources. A better public awareness campaign is needed. Question 23 The library's budget for depository services has remained flat; however the selective depository libraries have not requested any additional services. Question 25 The library and our customers value and see utility in the maintenance of the legacy collections. The more legacy material available full-text or virtually would improve access – however, the material must be indexed and fully searchable to be of use.

The New Mexico State Library is one of two Regional libraries in the State of New Mexico. The New Mexico State Plan articulates shared service responsibilities for the two Regional libraries, but does not directly consider shared collections. With the ready availability of current federal information on the internet, expedient document delivery mechanisms, and improved bibliographic control, consideration for the necessity of housing two collections in the State is overdue. Experience with both institutions over the past 18 years, however lends support to a more cautionary view, and the conclusion that redundant services (not necessarily in the same state) if not collections remain important to consider. Both institutions have experienced substantive administrative changes in the past 15 years resulting in an ebb and flow of support for their respective programs - and for depository libraries statewide. Winds can (and have) changed quickly along with each Regional Librarian's ability to provide support to depository libraries in the State. UNM has experienced both a fire and a flood in the past 5 years resulting in closed collections and redirecting of staff during times of recovery. The State Library was strong during that period of time, and able to step in and provide access to materials that were temporarily out of reach for UNM. The State Library's mission directs the depository to serve and train libraries in the State, while academic librarians are directed and supported towards national involvement to a higher degree. The balance has produced good results for the State. Currently, the State Library is experiencing difficulty filling a vacancy in their Regional Librarian position due to the increased cost of living in Santa Fe coupled with the low salaries offered by State Government. As a consequence of this extreme situation, New Mexico State Library is examining either relinquishing regional status or entering into a formal shared collection agreement. The Regional Librarian at the NM State Library is in basic agreement and support of the "Regional Depository Librarians' Perspective", and it is hoped that the long term experience of the two regional libraries in a relatively small state will point to the need for the national system to continue to carefully consider and support redundancies in service as well as collections. Support from institutions and governments, and access free of fire and flood that any given library takes for granted, might be here today and gone tomorrow.