



**Regional Depository Libraries Online Selections
Policy Post-Implementation Analysis:
Final Report**

Library Services and Content Management
Office of the Superintendent of Documents
U.S. Government Publishing Office

May 20, 2022
For public distribution

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Findings	1
Recommendations	2
Introduction & Background	3
Scope	4
Discussion & Findings.....	4
Usage Data	4
<i>Print Selectors</i>	4
<i>Regional Depository Libraries</i>	4
Library Catalog and Subject Guide Review.....	5
<i>Access via Library Catalog</i>	5
<i>Access via Government Information Subject Guide</i>	5
Focus Groups	5
<i>Print Selectors</i>	6
<i>Regional Depositories</i>	7
Survey Results.....	7
<i>About the Respondents</i>	8
<i>Responses to the Questions</i>	8
<i>Findings</i>	11
Conclusion.....	12
Constraints.....	12
Recommendations.....	13
References.....	13
Appendix 1: Focus Group Questions.....	Appendix I-1
Appendix 2: Survey Instrument.....	Appendix II-1

Executive Summary

A study was conducted from September to December, 2021 to test Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statement (SOD-PPS) 2021-1 [Regional Depository Libraries Online Selections](#), which allows for the deselection of authorized titles once four Print Selectors per title are secured. Two titles were tested: *Federal Register* and *Congressional Record* (daily).

After the test period, the Regional Online Selection Policy Implementation Team collected and analyzed data from regional depository coordinators who employed the policy (14), as well as from the selective depository coordinators served by those regionals (92), and Print Selectors (7). These data include:

- Usage data from the regional depositories that employed the policy.
 - Of the 12 that reported statistics, none reported interlibrary loan requests for tangible copies.
 - Of the 12 that reported statistics, none reported a user preference for print versions.
- Usage data from Print Selectors.
 - None of the 7 Print Selectors received interlibrary loan requests for the tangible version.
- Review of library catalogs and subject guides of Print Selectors and regional depositories coordinators who employed the policy.
- Focus groups with Print Selectors (4) and regional depositories coordinators who employed the policy (8).
 - The Print Selectors reported no impacts to their depository operations.
 - Regionals indicated support of the policy by recommending addition titles for online only selection.
- Survey of selective depository coordinators whose regional employed the policy.
 - All 92 respondents conveyed their regional's decision to deselect print versions had no impact on their depository operations.

Findings

This report conveys findings from the post-implementation data analysis:

1. Online selection by regional depository libraries had little to no effect on public or selective library access to the *Federal Register* or the daily *Congressional Record* during the test period.
2. Other titles should be considered for authorization under the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy in the future.

3. Communication between GPO and regional depository libraries, and between regional depository libraries and their selective depository libraries should increase for regional online selection to be successful.

Recommendations

The Regional Online Selections Policy Implementation Team recommends the following actions for LSCM:

1. Expand and authorize implementation of the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy to other eligible titles.
2. Give the highest priority to titles impacted by the elimination of microfiche distribution for authorization under the Regional Libraries Online Selection Policy. Titles that are later replaced by bound volumes should also be a priority.
3. Increase awareness and communication with depository libraries regarding implementation of the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy.
4. Provide best practices and other guidance for regional coordinators who select only the online version of titles. This should include increasing communication with their selective depository coordinators and reviewing the accuracy of access points, such as those found in the library's catalog and/or government information subject guides,

Introduction & Background

Effective September 1, 2021, the Superintendent of Documents authorized regional depository libraries to select the online (EL) versions of the daily *Congressional Record* (0994-B-01) and the *Federal Register* (0573-F) without having to select equivalent tangible versions. This authorization is in accordance with Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statement (SOD-PPS) 2021-1 [Regional Depository Libraries Online Selections](#).

Print selectors were secured in each of the four National Collection Service Areas — Northeast, South, Midwest, and West — for both the daily *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register*.

Congressional Record (Daily)

Augusta University, Reese Library (South)
University of South Carolina, Thomas Cooper Library (South)
State Library of Ohio (Midwest)
University of Colorado, Boulder, School of Law Library (West)
State Library of Pennsylvania (Northeast)
Vanderbilt University (South)

Federal Register

State Library of Ohio (Midwest)
Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Paul M. Herbert Law Center (South)
State Library of Pennsylvania (Northeast)
University of Colorado, Boulder, School of Law Library (West)

With this requirement met, and the subsequent authorization from the Superintendent of Documents, regional depository libraries were permitted to employ this policy and deselect tangible versions of these two titles.

At the outset, 14 regional depository libraries chose to implement this policy. Thirteen chose the online version of both titles, while 1 continued to select the daily *Congressional Record* in print format.

Auburn University at Montgomery	Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge
University of Alabama	University of Maryland, College Park
Arkansas State Library	University of Montana
University of Hawai'i at Mānoa	University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
University of Idaho	North Dakota State University
University of Iowa	University of North Dakota
University of Kentucky	Oklahoma State University

The Regional Depository Libraries Online Selections Policy Implementation Team was appointed to establish implementation procedures for SOD-PPS-2021-1, test them, and assess the impact of the policy.

Scope

This report covers findings and analysis of the data gathered to determine the impact of Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statement (SOD-PPS) 2021-1.

The following methods were used in the analysis:

- Usage data from Print Selectors and the regional depositories that employed the policy.
- Review of library catalogs and subject guides of Print Selectors and regional depositories coordinators who employed the policy.
- Focus groups with Print Selectors and regional depositories coordinators who employed the policy.
- Survey of selective depository coordinators whose regional employed the policy.

Discussion & Findings

Usage Data

Print Selectors and regional depository libraries that deselected the tangible formats for one or both of the titles were required to maintain monthly statistics during the September 1, 2021-December 31, 2021 analysis period. Print Selectors maintained statistics over the entire interval, while regional depository libraries maintained statistics from the time they deselected the tangible format(s) through December 31, 2021.

Print Selectors

During the analysis period, none of the seven Print Selectors received interlibrary loan (ILL) requests for the title(s) they selected and retained in print format. Out of the six Print Selectors for the daily *Congressional Record*, only one Print Selector reported requests for or referrals to the title, receiving two requests. For the *Federal Register*, only one of the four Print Selectors reported requests for or referrals to the title, receiving two requests/referrals occurring during the analysis period. None of the Print Selectors reported a library user indicating a preference for the print format.

Regional Depository Libraries

Statistics were received from 12 of the 14 regional depository libraries that deselected tangible formats for one or both of the titles between September 1, 2021-December 31, 2021. During the analysis period, none of the 12 reporting regionals submitted ILL requests for patrons preferring the print version of title(s) they were selecting only in the online format.

Eleven of the 12 reporting regionals deselected tangible formats for the daily *Congressional Record*. Of those 11, two regionals reported requests for or referrals to the title, with one regional documenting five request/referrals, and one regional reporting one. All 12 reporting regionals deselected the print version *Federal Register*, but none reported requests for or referrals to the title during the analysis period. None of the regionals reported a library user indicating a preference for the print format.

Library Catalog and Subject Guide Review

To assess discovery and accessibility of the online format, the Regional Online Selection Policy Team reviewed the library catalog and government information subject guide(s), when available, of each regional depository that deselected tangible formats for one or both of the titles between September 1, 2021-December 31, 2021.

Access via Library Catalog

Thirteen of the 13 regional depositories (100%) that deselected the daily *Congressional Record* in tangible formats during the analysis period have a catalog record that provides electronic access to the title, and 12 of the 13 (92.31%) provide access via a GPO Persistent URL (PURL). Similarly, 14 of the 14 regional depositories (100%) that deselected the *Federal Register* in tangible formats during the analysis period have a catalog record that provides electronic access to the title, and 12 of the 14 (85.71%) provide access via a GPO PURL.

Access via Government Information Subject Guide

Ten of the 13 regional depositories that deselected the daily *Congressional Record* in tangible formats have a subject guide for Federal Government information, and 6 of the 10 (60%) include a link to the daily *Congressional Record* on that page. Eleven of the 14 regional depositories that deselected the *Federal Register* in tangible formats have a subject guide for Federal Government information, and 5 of the 11 (45.45%) include a link to the *Federal Register*. None of the subject guide links to either the daily *Congressional Record* or *Federal Register* were a GPO PURL, and several referenced FDsys (the predecessor system to **govinfo**), or had incorrect coverage dates that did not reflect title coverage on **govinfo**.

Focus Groups

Print Selectors and regional depositories that deselected the tangible formats for one or both of the titles were invited to attend three focus group sessions in February 2022. The focus groups were scheduled to last for 90 min each, but in all cases, the discussion did not exceed 60 minutes. In order to keep the participant pool under 10 to facilitate discussion, two focus group sessions (February 15th and 17th) were arranged for regional depository libraries that deselected tangible formats for either title. The same discussion

questions were used for both of those focus groups. A separate focus group was arranged for Print Selectors for one or both titles, and a separate discussion question instrument was developed for that focus group.

Print Selectors

The Print Selectors were asked if they would have volunteered for these titles if they were non-superseding, and most said yes, they would have, but the reasons they cited varied. The law libraries in the group reported that the titles are important to their users, and that they bind their *Federal Register* issues for long-term preservation, even though it supersedes. A state library reported that they would have volunteered because they believe they have a mandate to collect FDLP material comprehensively. The coordinator for a depository that participates in a distributed regional collection cited that print retention agreement as the reason they would have also made this decision if these titles did not supersede. One Print Selector hesitated to say they would have volunteered for these titles if they did not supersede because they face space constraints, and they retain the bound title in perpetuity.

When asked if they would consider entering into day-forward Preservation Steward agreements for non-superseding titles, the depository coordinators stated that, again, it would depend on the title, and how that title fits into their collection development and management plans, and agreements. They stated that they would be less likely to sign a print retention agreement if that title is available electronically. It is worth noting that any title eligible for the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection policy is available electronically through **govinfo** or another trusted digital repository. They also again cited space constraints as major factor in their decision making when it comes to print retention agreements. One depository coordinator stated that for every title that is committed under a print retention agreement, his institution would have to evaluate the impact on the overall footprint of their FDLP collection.

The Print Selectors reported no impacts to their depository operations (i.e., staffing, processing time, public access, ability to serve selectives [for the regional depositories in the group] and storage space) due to serving as a Print Selector. They added that they had adequate space in their facility for the term of the Print Selector print retention agreement for both titles. Additionally, they all stated that they had no requests for the print format of the title during the test period.

When asked about potential incentives for Print Selector volunteers, all agreed that the receipt of related catalog records would be duplicative of their current cataloging workflows, including enrollment in LSCM's Cataloging Record Distribution Program (CRDP). One participant suggested that a selective depository might be willing to serve as a

Preservation Steward for a bound title they are not allowed to select in print currently (Congressional Record Bound and the Serial Set).

Regional Depositories

When asked why they decided to select only the online format for these titles, the regional coordinators reported very low use of these print, superseding titles that they did not retain in perpetuity. They also reported that processing these paper titles took more staff time than their FTEs could easily support. Finally, they cited space constraints, and that another selective depository in close proximity collects these titles in print.

The titles regional depository coordinators suggested for authorization under the Regional Online Selection Policy are those that take up substantial shelf space, require regular processing, and see very little use, including the Code of Federal Regulations, Motor Use Vehicle Maps, and the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) Record. In addition, they suggested that the policy be extended to apply to those congressional titles impacted by the end of microfiche distribution. They did not feel there are any titles that regionals should not be allowed to deselect in a tangible format, trusting that each regional depository will consider their own user community needs. One regional depository coordinator stated that the Code of Federal Regulations is so much easier to use in print that she would continue to select it, even if it were authorized for deselection under the policy.

The regional depository coordinators all informed their selective depository libraries, via various communication methods (e.g., synchronous video call meeting, email) about their decision to deselect the tangible formats for these titles, and they reported very little feedback. One selective depository coordinator expressed support for the decision. One regional coordinator wondered if the selective depository libraries were not at all concerned because these titles are superseding, and are not FDL P material they rely on the regional collection to maintain in perpetuity.

Survey Results

Two-hundred and twenty-one selective depositories are served by the fourteen regionals that opted to make available the online version of the daily *Congressional Record*, the *Federal Register*, or both. Their depository coordinators were sent an email on January 19, 2022 inviting them to complete and submit a six-question survey that would help LSCM determine if and how selective depositories were impacted by regional coordinator decisions to select solely the online version of the daily *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register* moving forward. When the survey closed almost three weeks later, on Monday, February 7, ninety-two (43%) selective depository coordinator email recipients had responded to the survey.

About the Respondents

All library sizes (S, M, L) and types of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) are represented by the respondents:

- | | |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|
| Academic, Community College (AC) | Highest State Court (SC) |
| Academic, General (AG) | Public (PU) |
| Academic, Law (AL) | Service Academy (SA) |
| Federal Agency (FA) | Special (SP) |
| Federal Court (FC) | State (SL) |

Geographically, surveys were submitted from the four National Collection Service Areas (NCSA) – Northeast, South, Midwest, and West. Surveys were received from all states and the District of Columbia, served by the regional depository libraries that chose to select only the online versions of daily *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register*. These data are shown in the table below.

Survey respondents by library type, library size, and National Collection Service Area

DEPOSITORY LIBRARY TYPE	LIBRARY SIZE			NE NCSA	LIBRARY SIZE			SOUTH NCSA	LIBRARY SIZE			MW NCSA	LIBRARY SIZE			WEST NCSA	TOTAL BY LIBRARY TYPE	TOTAL BY SIZE		
	L	M	S		L	M	S		L	M	S		L	M	S			L	M	S
Academic, CC	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3				
Academic, Gen	3	2	0	5	9	19	6	34	1	3	1	5	1	2	4	7	51			
Academic, Law	0	2	0	5	0	4	0	4	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	8			
Federal Agency	1	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5			
Federal Court	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2			
Highest State Ct	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	2	3	6			
Public	2	0	0	2	3	1	3	7	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	3	13			
Service Academy	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			
Special	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1			
State	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2			
TOTALS	6	8	4	18	12	25	13	50	1	5	3	9	3	3	9	15	92	22	41	29

Responses to the Questions

Questions 1 and 2

Were you aware that your Regional depository coordinator opted to select only the online version of the ...?

	Congressional Record (Daily)	Federal Register
Yes	47	47
No	45	44
Yes & No	0	1
TOTAL	92	92

Respondents were almost equally divided when it came to knowing whether their regional depository coordinator had selected online versions of either, or both, the daily *Congressional Record* or the *Federal Register*. With 51%, those who knew their regional's

decision outnumbered those who were not aware. In an anomaly, one person did and didn't know their regional's decision for the *Federal Register*.

Question 3

Do you know which depository library is a Print Selector for the area served by your regional depository library?

Awareness of Print Selectors

	No	Yes	Total
Academic, CC	1	2	3
Academic, Gen	37	14	51
Academic, Law	4	4	8
Federal Agency	5	0	5
Federal Court	2	0	2
Highest State Ct	3	3	6
Public	10	3	13
Service Academy	1	0	1
Special	1	0	1
State	2	0	2
Total	66	26	92

Of the 92 respondents, 71% were unaware of which depository libraries serve as Print Selectors in their region.

When looking at the responses by library type, both law school and Highest State Court libraries had the same number of "Yes" responses as they did "No" responses. With 27% of their 51 responses, the general academic libraries had the greatest number of respondents that knew which libraries were Print Selectors.

Question 4

Was your depository operation negatively impacted by your regional's decision to select only the online version of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or the *Federal Register*?

All 92 respondents conveyed their regional's decision to the deselect print version of the daily *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register* had no impact on their depository operations.

Question 5

The following operations in my depository library were affected by my regional's decision to select only the online version of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or *Federal Register* (select all that apply):

- Reference service
- Collection management
- Other, please specify: _____
- My regional's decision did not affect my depository's operation

One person indicated that the management of their depository collection was affected by their regional's decision. The other 91 respondents reported having not been affected by their regional's decision to select only the online version of a title.

Question 6

Please describe how the regional's decision to select one or both of these superseding titles only in the online format impacted your depository operation. If there was no impact, please respond with NA.

Given that 100% of respondents in Question 4 indicated they were not affected by their regional turning to online versions of the daily *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register*, it is not surprising that 95% (88) answered this question with NA, or similar phrasing, e.g., “No impact” or “did not affect my library”. And still others responded with NA but included an explanation for their answer, for e.g., these recurring themes: “because we are receiving the titles in print” and “We would also like to deselect the tangible version of both titles”.

Of the four remaining comments, one conveyed the importance of having access to primary source materials, and that they rely on their regional for the *Congressional Record*. The other three responses conveyed more positive impacts: “We are happy to have more items available online”; “I believe her decision will benefit many libraries in our region”; and “it makes me wonder if this would be a good option for us.” All responses to Question 6 are in the table below.

Free Text Responses to Question 6	Response Count
I consider it a positive impact, as these titles are rarely used on the daily basis, and many libraries are going through issues with regard to space in their buildings. Our regional depository coordinator, Renée Bosman, has visited our library to help us with a weeding project and gave very good advice on selections and collection upkeep. I believe her decision will benefit many libraries in our region.	1
I did not know they had opted out of receiving print copies of these documents. It makes me wonder if this would be a good option for us.	1
<i>It does not impact us.</i> We select the Congressional Record and the Federal Register in print format.	1
N/A I was unaware.	1
N/A other than we feel free to do the same.	1
NA	78
NA because we are receiving these titles in print.	1
NA We would also like to deselect the tangible version of both titles.	1
NA. It was a positive experience. Everyone wanted the online and saved us tons of processing time.	1
<i>No affect</i>	1
<i>No impact</i>	1
<i>Not at all...</i> our federal documents collection includes all the print volumes for Annals of Congress, Register of Debates, Congressional Globe, and Congressional Record (up to 1977). Online access after 1977 is sufficient. As for the Federal Register, patrons are more interested in current rather than older versions so the online suffices.	1
<i>The decision did not affect my library.</i>	1
The NC Supreme Court Library relied on our regional depository for the Congressional Record. As of now, the NC Supreme Court Library receives microfiche of the Federal Register. It is important for our library to be able to access primary law materials.	1
We are happy to have more items available online. We receive limited printed versions of titles.	1
Total	92

Findings

While only 43% of the eligible depository library coordinators responded to the survey, there was cohesion in the responses to most of the questions. Most importantly, when asked in Question 4 if their depository operation was negatively impacted by their regional's decision to select only the online version of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or the *Federal Register*, there was 100% agreement that there was no negative impact.

One of the ninety-two responses indicated in Question 5 that collection management was affected by their regional depository coordinator deselecting tangible and selecting the online version of the authorized titles. However, when asked in Question 6 to describe how their depository operation was affected, the respondent who indicated their collection management operations were affected opted not to explain and responded with NA.

Question 6 was designed to obtain explanations of how depository operations were affected. While most responded with NA, a few noted positive impacts. One respondent shared that they are reliant on their regional depository for the *Congressional Record*, and imparted how important primary source material is for their library.

The most divisive responses were with Questions 1-3, which asked about “awareness”, and the responses to them were divided. There were forty-seven “Yes” responses for both the daily *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register* when it came to knowing whether their regional depository coordinator had selected the online version of either, or both of these titles. Only 28% of respondents were aware of which libraries are serving as Print Selectors for their National Collection Service Area. Awareness can be remediated easily with increased communication from LSCM to depository libraries, and from regional depositories to the selective depository libraries they serve.

Though many depository libraries have moved, or are moving toward a mostly-digital access environment, one still has to wonder what affect the pandemic had on the potential use of the tangible versions of the daily *Congressional Record* and *Federal Register*, and on the impact analysis of the regional online selections policy implementation.

From the beginning of the pandemic, a form was provided for depository libraries to notify LSCM of their “open” status and their ability to receive depository shipments. Not all depository libraries submitted the form. Seventy-eight (85%) of the ninety-two selective depository coordinators who completed the impact analysis survey, also submitted the notification form. At the time the notification form was removed, January 10, 2022, seventy-seven (99%) of the seventy-eight depositories were open to staff, and only twenty-four (31%) were open to the general public. It must be noted that additional libraries may have been open during the impact analysis survey, but they did not submit a notification form, or update their status.

Conclusion

The following conclusions were made based on these findings.

When regional depository libraries deselect a title in print, the regional should take that opportunity to review access points to the title in online format, including access from the library catalog and/or government information subject guide(s).

The Regional Online Selection Policy Team recommends utilizing GPO PURLs for all access points, both to ensure ongoing access and to allow the depository to track usage statistics via the FDL PURL Usage Report Tool (<http://purlreferrals.fdlp.gov/>). The Team also recommends clearly labeling links to the online format on **govinfo**, which the regional is selecting in lieu of tangible formats, to differentiate from free or commercial sources. Clear labeling includes the source (**govinfo** or the U.S. Government Publishing Office), and accurate holdings information.

The decision to enter into a Print Selector retention agreement was linked to other determining factors such as: use, collaborative collection management agreements, and perceived vision and mission of the library, and not exclusively the fact that these titles supersede. This indicates that Preservation Steward agreements (permanent print retention) will appeal to libraries when they support their collection development and management plans.

In the immediate near term, titles considered for authorization under the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy should be those that are impacted by the elimination of microfiche distribution. As bound print materials better support the National Collection goal of permanent print public access, consideration should also be given to superseding titles that require staff processing time and are eventually replaced by bound versions.

Constraints

It is important to note that this policy implementation impact testing was conducted during a period of time when many libraries were either closed or provided limited access, and their operations were curtailed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Once additional titles are authorized for regional online-only selection, and depository libraries have reopened to the general public, another survey of selective depository coordinators served by regional depository libraries deselecting tangible formats should be conducted. This will confirm the findings of this survey in a “more normal” environment, or it may bring to the fore challenges that may arise over time that need to be addressed.

Recommendations

The Regional Online Selections Policy Implementation Team recommends the following actions for LSCM:

1. Expand and authorize implementation of the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy to other eligible titles.
2. Give the highest priority to titles impacted by the elimination of microfiche distribution for authorization under the Regional Libraries Online Selection Policy. Titles that are later replaced by bound volumes should also be a priority.
3. Increase awareness and communication with depository libraries regarding implementation of the Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy.
4. Provide best practices and other guidance for regional coordinators who select only the online version of titles. This should include increasing communication with their selective depository coordinators and reviewing the accuracy of access points, such as those found in the library's catalog and/or Government information subject guides.

References

Superintendent of Documents Public Policy Statement (SOD-PPS) 2021-1 [Regional Depository Libraries Online Selections](#)

FDLP PURL Usage Report Tool <http://purlreferrals.fdlp.gov/>

Appendix 1: Focus Group Questions

Print Selector Focus Group Questions – Focus Group, Feb. 22, 1 PM ET

1. Would you have volunteered if titles did not supersede?
 1. Why or why not?
 2. Titles that do not supersede will require Preservation Steward agreements be in place before they can become eligible for Regional Online Selection. In what circumstances would you choose to serve as a Preservation Steward for non-superseding titles?
2. How has being a Print Selector affected the following:
 1. Staffing
 2. Space
 3. Time
 4. Ability to provide access
 5. Ability to serve selectives (for regional depository Print Selectors)
3. Would getting catalog records along with the titles be an incentive to serve in this Print Selector role?
 1. Would the receipt of catalog records be repetitive for your current cataloging workflows?

Regionals that have Implemented ROLS Focus Group Questions – Focus Group, Feb. 15 and Feb. 17, 1 PM ET

1. WHY did you choose to select only the online format, with no corresponding tangible format(s), for this title/these titles?
2. Are there any other any other titles you would like to see authorized under the Regional Online Selection Policy?
 1. Why that title?
3. Are there any titles you feel strongly should not be authorized under the Regional Online Selection Policy?
 1. Why not that title?
4. How did you notify your selectives about your decision to implement this policy for this title/these titles?
 1. What feedback did you receive from your selectives about this decision, if any?
5. Do you measure usage for accessing the online format of these titles?
 1. How do you measure usage?

Appendix 2: Survey Instrument

Regional Online Selection and Paper Deselection: Impact on Selective Depository Libraries

On September 1, 2021, in accordance with [SOD-PPS-2021-1 Regional Depository Libraries Online Selection Policy](#), regional coordinators were authorized by the Superintendent of Documents to deselect the tangible versions of the daily *Congressional Record* and the *Federal Register*, and rely on the online versions of those titles.

This short survey was sent to selective depository coordinators whose regional coordinator opted to implement the policy by deselecting the paper version of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or *Federal Register*. The purpose of the survey is to determine if and how selective depositories were impacted by this decision.

Thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to participate in this survey.

First Name: _____

Last Name: _____

Depository Library Number _____

Survey Questions

1. Were you aware that your Regional depository coordinator opted to select only the online version of the daily *Congressional Record*?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Not applicable, my regional selects a tangible version.
2. Were you aware that your Regional depository coordinator opted to select only the online version of the *Federal Register*?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Not applicable, my regional selects a tangible version.

3. Do you know which depository library is a Print Selector for the area served by your regional depository library?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
4. Was your depository operation negatively impacted by your regional's decision to select only online versions of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or the *Federal Register*?
 - a. Yes
 - b. No
5. The following operations in my depository library were affected by my regional's decision to select only the online versions of the daily *Congressional Record* and/or *Federal Register* (select all that apply):
 - a. Reference service
 - b. Collection management
 - c. Other, please specify _____.
 - d. My regional's decision did not affect my depository's operations.
6. Please describe how the regional's decision to select one or both of these superseding titles only in the online format impacted your depository operation. If there was no impact, please respond with NA.