

FDLP Virtual Meeting: Regional Issues

February 8, 2018





Welcome Remarks Superintendent of Documents (SupDocs)

- Presentations by GPO staff on topics related to regional libraries in the FDLP
- Updates and progress reports
- Q&A

P

Agenda

- Update: Preservation Stewards & other GPO partnerships
- Update: GPO On the Go, visiting regionals
- Biennial Survey Results: Focused on regional data
- Update: The Regional Discard Policy & FDLP eXchange
- Models for Shared Regionals
- Title 44 Modernization

Access U.S. Government information on the go and on the shelf.



GPO Partnerships: An Update

Suzanne Ebanues

New Preservation Stewards

- Wise Law Library, University of Colorado, Boulder
- Indiana State Library
- University of South Carolina
- U.S Merchant Marine Academy
- Law Library for San Bernardino County
- University of Maine



Preservation Stewards MOAs

N

Public release
 section added to
 template

 Copies of all signed MOAs now publicly available

| Partner Categories | 6 | |
|--|---|--------------------|
| Preservation Steward: Preserva length of the partnership agreeme includes both preventive maintena | | |
| Preservation Steward FAQs | Memorandum of Agreement for Preservation Stewards | Sample Titles List |
| Signed Agreements | | |
| 🔑 Indiana State Library F | Preservation Steward MOA New | |
| 🕒 Law Library for San Be | ernardino County Preservation Steward MO | ANew |
| 🕑 State Library of Ohio F | Preservation Steward MOA New | |
| | | |



Preservation Stewards and Regional Discard

- Congressional Record
- Congressional hearings
- Public Papers of the Presidents





Other Partnership Categories



 Digital Content Contributor guidance

Digital Preservation Steward criteria

Digital Access
 Partner criteria



Become a GPO Partner



- Learn more: FDLP.gov > About the FDLP > Partnerships
- Talk with the Partnership Team at: <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/partners</u> <u>hip-inquiry-form</u>
- Or email sebanues@gpo.gov.

Ņ

Questions?

Suzanne Ebanues sebanues@gpo.gov





GPO on the Go: Continuing the Regional Visits

Robin Haun-Mohamed

P

- Since the GPO on the Go! initiative began, GPO has visited 472 libraries.
- GPO staff from all offices have visited libraries, helps promote the FDLP.
- Visits are in response to requests for participation (anniversaries, library re-openings, etc.).
- LSCM staff have visited libraries with a focus on listening to what library staff have to say and, in general, reintroducing ourselves to the libraries.

- Current focus in FY18: visits to regional libraries:
 - Good time to keep regionals up-to-date on new initiatives:
 - Approval of regional discard
 - Preservation Stewards partnerships
 - Information related to FDLP eXchange

ø

- Many new regional coordinators
- Many regional libraries have not been visited in 15 20 years
 - Changes in how libraries make material available
 - Changes in the types of Federal information available
 - Changes in administration of the FDLP



- Regional visits also provide:
 - Opportunity for the regional librarian to share information with GPO about the libraries in their region.
 - Potential attendance at regional meetings, if at the same time.
 - Opportunity to share with library administration how important the regional coordinator and collection are for the FDLP.



- Promotional Material:
 - Visiting the regional libraries provides an opportunity to highlight the new promotional materials available for libraries to use for depository outreach.
 - New set of promotional materials sent out to libraries last fall. Toss the older material away. New eagle emblem for library doors and windows. To order more go to <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/promotion</u>.

Access U.S. Government information **on the go** and **on the shelf.**







in



GPO U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE | Keeping America Informed

Ņ

Questions?

Robin Haun-Mohamed rhaun-mohamed@gpo.gov



2017 Biennial Survey: Region Reports

Ashley Dahlen



)

The 2017 Biennial Survey

- The Biennial Survey:
 - Requirement for all libraries to respond to the Biennial Survey questions.
 - Number of libraries responding
 - Survey analysis has started
 - All responses will be made available after analysis is complete <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/biennial-</u> <u>survey</u>

ø

Region Reports

- Compiles data for libraries in each region
- Individual library responses are provided
- Questions 18 23 in particular are geared to provide regional staff an overview of:
 - The quantity of material held in each library
 - What formats are available
 - What the intended plans the material are
 - Whether or not it is cataloged
- Estimated release is early spring



| FDL# 0099 | Paper 30,000 items | Microfiche 18.75 linear feet | DVDs, CD- ROMs, VHS tapes, and floppy diskettes 20 items | Question 21. In general, would you say that the tangible depository collection currently reflects: A collection of resources that needs to be weeded in a large-scale weeding project. | Question 22. My library plans to weed the tangible collection to: (Select all that apply) Remove some material when online equivalents are available Remove some superseded material Remove some tangible depository material (in accordance with state or region processes) | Question 23. How much of your tangible collection would you estimate is fully cataloged? For example, "50%" 95% |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| 0099A | 1 | 0 | 0 | The core reference resources my library needs to meet current and future research needs in a print format. No major weeding projects are planned. | Not Applicable – We are not planning on weeding the tangible depository collection. | 0 |
| 0100 | approx. 100 volumes | none | none | The core reference resources my library needs to meet current and future research needs in a print format. No major weeding projects are planned. | Not Applicable – We have recently completed a weeding project, and our depository collection only requires minimal maintenance. | 100% |
| 0100A | 17,773 | 0 | 558 | The general resources my library needs to meet the information needs of future and current researchers. No major weeding projects are planned. | | 100% |
| 0100C | 700 | 1,000 | 300 +∥+ | The general resources my library needs to meet the information needs of future and current researchers. No major weeding projects are planned. | Remove some material when online equivalents are available Remove some superseded material | |
| 0100D | We select 3.5 % of available publications. | 5 titles | 0 | A comprehensive research collection. No major weeding projects are planned. | Not Applicable – We are not planning on weeding the tangible depository collection. | 100% |
| 0101A | 15,000 volumes | 0 | 0 | A collection of resources that needs to be weeded in a large-scale weeding project. | Remove all material when online equivalents are available | 100% |
| 0101C | 1100 publications | Federal Register, Congressional Record, CFR, and various legislative histories. Approximately 3,000 fiche. | One - Budget of the United States | The general resources my library needs to meet the information needs of future and current researchers. No major weeding projects are planned. | Remove some material when online equivalents are available Remove some superseded material Remove some tangible depository material (in accordance with state or region processes) | 75% |



Early Findings

Libraries Report:

- Working consortially, ex. with HathiTrust
- Exploring becoming Preservation Stewards
- That they are "EL only" (when they are not)

Number of libraries reporting that they are remodeling or changing the use of physical space is high



Feedback?

Do regionals have different questions for their selectives that would help them manage their region?

fdlpoutreach@gpo.gov

Ņ

Questions?

Ashley Dahlen adahlen@gpo.gov





Regional Discard & The FDLP eXchange

Lisa Russell



P

Regional Discards

 GPO requested and received JCP approval to allow regionals to discard certain materials with approval from the Superintendent of Documents

- To be eligible for discard, the publication must
 - Have been retained by the regional for a minimum of seven years
 - Be available and digitally signed on FDsys/govinfo
 - Be held in tangible form in at least four geographically distributed FDLP libraries

ø

Regional Discards

- Initially established a manual process for submitting and processing requests to discard materials
- Regionals allowed to request permission to discard beginning September 2016
- Details on current process available on the project page <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/project-list/regional-discard-policy</u>
- Next steps are to automate process

ø

FDLP eXchange

- Initial implementation of Library Services System (LSS)
- One-stop-shop for the entire needs and offers process
- Training site launched in October 2017
- Training site link and other project information available on the project page <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/project-list/fdlp-exchange</u>
- Training site URL will change when production site launches



FDLP eXchange

- GPO staff available to meet with regions testing and revising processes
- Depository coordinators should contact GPO for account information <u>https://www.fdlp.gov/needs-offers-tool-feedback</u>
- Production site launch TBD
- Future development will incorporate regional discard processes and preservation steward requirements



Project pages

Regional Discard

https://www.fdlp.gov/project-list/regional-discardpolicy

FDLP eXchange

https://www.fdlp.gov/project-list/fdlp-exchange

Ņ

Questions?

Lisa Russell Irussell@gpo.gov





Revisiting Shared Regionals: And Other Regional Models

Cindy Etkin



Why revisit shared regionals?

- Ten years have passed
- Regionals need flexibility to manage large tangible collections
- JCP approval of the Superintendent of Documents policy allowing regionals to discard depository materials under certain circumstances

ø

Why revisit shared regionals?

 Continued depository community support for interstate shared regionals

 National Plan action item: Allow for shared regionals across state boundaries

 Depository Library Council and LSCM/GPO recommended interstate shared regionals be included in a revised U.S.C. Chapter 19, Title 44

ø

Guidelines for Establishing Shared Regional Depositories

- Proposed shared regional plan
- GPO facilitate the planning process
- Review by the SupDocs
- Approval of Senators (interstate regionals)
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)
- Transition and implementation


FDLP News Alert

News & Events

Seeking Community Input - Revisiting Shared Regional Depository Libraries



Details Last Updated: November 30 2017 Published: November 30 2017

The U.S. Government Publishing Office (GPO) is revisiting models for shared regional depository libraries. A discussion draft of guidelines for establishing shared regionals is now available.

GPO is interested in knowing your thoughts about the guidelines and any suggestions you may have to make them more useful. You may submit comments through Depository Library Council contact form until January 20, 2018.

A regional virtual meeting planned for February 2018 will address this topic, among many others. Look for an announcement soon to register for this meeting. All members of the FDLP community will be welcome.



Feedback

Six submissions received

- Two library associations
- Three regionals
- One selective

P

Comments

- Very optimistic the criteria will provide greatly increased flexibility
- Received universally favorable response
- Will foster innovative new collection models
- Long overdue
- Great value in providing guidelines
- Providing additional flexibility and guidance to the community is very much appreciated

ø

Comments

- Pleased to see more flexibility and encouragement from GPO to establish models for regional collections that can be innovative and fit the needs of different regions
- Writing to share my strong support of these guidelines
- Shows a commitment to support regionals by offering flexibility
- Thanks to GPO for being responsive to community feedback

Ņ

Suggested Substantive Edits

- p.1, 2nd bullet: consent of <u>at least one</u> Senator from <u>each</u> the participating states ...
- p. 2, 3rd bullet: ... all participating libraries <u>that are</u> <u>assuming portions of the Regional Depository Library's</u> <u>responsibilities</u>. (2)
- p.3, 4th bullet: Notify the parties of the decision determination that the MOU meets established criteria and is approved for signatures and implementation.



Suggested Substantive Edits

(continued)

- p.3, 9th bullet: Clear statement that all regional requirements of the FDLP statutory requirements for Regional Depository Libraries continue to be in effect. (2)
- p.3, footnote 1: consent of the Senators at least one Senator

from each participating state is to be submitted with the draft MOU.



Suggested Substantive Edits (continued)

- Define and distinguish the difference between shared regionals and multi-state regionals.
- p.2, bullet 2: Consult with selective depository libraries in the state(s) and assure consider that their reasonable concerns are addressed prior to signing an MOU.
- p.2: While GPO is not a signatory of the agreement ... to ensure there are no conflicts between the provisions of the MOU and Title 44 of the United States Code, and other FDLP guidance.



Suggested Substantive Edits (continued)

- The suggested criterion that Senators from all states support and consent to the sharing of collections across state lines appears unnecessary under § 1912 of Title 44; Senators don't need to approve new collaborations.
- Guidelines do not distinguish between simple shared housing agreements and fully shared regionals.
 Libraries with shared regional agreements should have recognition as regional depository libraries.
- Need more clarity on the models that are covered by the Guidelines



Existing Regional Models

| | Table key 1 regional serving 1 state | | | | onal serving multiple Shates or areas | | nared regional within 1 State | | | | regional with a ributed collection | | |
|-------|--|--|-------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|--|---------|---------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------|
| State | # Regionals | Regionals | | | | | # Selectives Served Area(s) Served | | Model | | | | |
| AL | 2 | Auburn University, Montgomery University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa | | | | | 20 | | Alabama | | Full regionals | | |
| AZ | 1 | Arizona State Library, Archives & Public R | | | | ublic Records | 10 | | Arizona | | Full regional | | |
| AR | 1 | Arka | State | # Regionals | Regior | nals | # Selectives Served | | rved | Area(s) Served | Model | | |
| CA | 1 | Calif | ME | 1 | Univer | sity of Maine, O | ono 23 | | | ME, NH, VT | Multi-state | | |
| со | 1 | Univ | MD | 1 | Univer | sity of Maryland | l, College Park | | 60 | | MD, DE, DC | Multi-state | |
| СТ | 1 | Con | MA | 1 | Boston | Public Library | | | 26 | | Massachusetts | Full regional | |
| FL | 1 | Univ | MN | 1 | Univer | sity of Minnesot | ta, Minneapolis | | 70 | | MN, SD, MI | Multi-state | |
| GA | 1 | Univ | MS | 1 | University of Mississippi, University | | | | 10 | | Mississippi | Full regional | |
| ні | 1 | Univ | мо | 1 | University of Missouri, Columbia | | | | 28 | | Missouri | Distributed Collection | |
| ID | 1 | Univ | MT | 1 | Univer | sity of Montana | , Missoula | | 10 | | Montana | Full regional | |
| IL | 1 | Illin | NE | NE 1 University of Nebrask | | | Lincoln 11 | | | Nebraska | Full regional | | |
| IN | 1 | Indi | NV | 0 | | | | | | | | No regional | |
| IA | 1 | Univ | СИ | 1 | State | # Regionals | Regionals | | | | # Selectives Served | Area(s) Served | Model |
| KS | 1 | Univ | NM | 1 | TN | 1 | University of Memp | | | 20 | Tennessee | Full regional ¹ | |
| KY | 1 | Univ | | 1 | тх | 2 | Texas State Library Texas Tech Univers | | | 54 | Texas | Full regionals | |
| LA | 2 | Loui Loui | NC | 1 | UT | 1 | Utah State Universi | | | 8 | Utah | Full regional | |
| | | 200 | ND | 2 | VA | 1 | University of Virgin | ia, Cha | arlottesville | | 32 | Virginia | Full regional |
| | | | он | 1 | WA | 1 | Washington State L | library | | | 25 | WA, AK | Multi-state |
| | | | ок | 1 | wv | 1 | West Virginia Unive | ersity, | Morgantown | | 12 | West Virginia | Full regional |
| | | | OR | 1 | WI | 2 | University of Wisco Milwaukee Public Li | | 1adison | | 17 | Wisconsin | Full regionals |
| | | | PA | 1 | WY | 0 | | | | | | | No regional |
| | | | SC | 1 | Total | 47 | | | | | | | |

ø

Not all existing regional models are covered in the draft Guidelines



Ņ

Questions?

Cindy Etkin cetkin@gpo.gov



Title 44 Modernization: Where does the draft bill take us?

Laurie B. Hall Cindy Etkin



)

Intersection of Ideas



Title 44 Modernization Input

Individuals

- Preservation
- ✓ Free access
- Definition of publication
- More digital
- Privacy
- Item selections
- Discard process
- Shared print archives
- ✓ Deposit digital files in FDLs
- Regional discard/substitution
- Regional flexibility
- Grant authority

Organizations

- Definition of publication
- ✓ Free access
- Preservation
- Privacy
- Deposit digital files in FDLs
- ✓ Regional flexibility
- Grant authority & gift authority
- New categories of libraries
- Strengthen relationship with Federal agencies
- Protect integrity of digital content
- ✓ Repeal 10,000 book requirement



Draft Bill to Modernize Title 44

| G3CMTFAHAA15VCP.OMNLXML [Draft] |
|--|
| |
| |
| [DRAFT] |
| DECEMBER 11, 2017 |
| 115TH CONGRESS 1ST SREEDON H.R. |
| To amend title 44, United Statas Code, to reform the organization, authori- tics, and programs relating to public printing and documents, including the Federal Depository Library Program, and for other purposes. |
| IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES |
| M . introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on |
| 35 |
| A BILL |
| To amend title 44, United States Code, to reform the organi- zation, authorities, and programs relating to public print- ing and documents, including the Federal Depository Library Program, and for other purposes. |
| 1 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa- |
| 2 tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, |
| 3 SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS. |
| 4 (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "?? |
| 5 Act". [to be provided] |

- Committee on House Administration
- December 11, 2017
- Not yet introduced
- Committee mark-up in Feb.
- Three chapters:
 - 1. Government Printing Office
 - 3. Implementation of Authorities
 - 5. No-fee Public Access To Government Information



Draft Bill: The Positive

- Reaffirms the public's right to no-fee access to their Government's information.
- Protects user privacy.
- Recognizes formats beyond print and microfacsimile.
- Obligates agencies to furnish the SupDocs with tangible and digital IDPs (legal deposit).
- Provides for depository libraries to receive digital content from GPO (digital deposit).

ø

Draft Bill: The Positive (continued)

- Provides for regionals to opt out of receiving tangible IDPs.
- Establishes a National Collection of Government Information Dissemination Products and the lifecycle responsibilities necessary in managing it.
- Authorizes cataloging and indexing the corpus of the National Collection.
- Includes a program to identify and bring fugitive documents under bibliographic control.

!

Draft Bill: The Positive (continued)

- Allows for regionals to share collections across state boundaries.
- Provides grant and gift authority for GPO.
- Conveys the importance of education by including a program for training and continuing education.
- Provides for appointment of advisory committees.
- Recognizes that the current number of regional depository libraries is not necessary.



Minimum Requirements for FDLs

- Provide members of the public with no-fee access to all of the IDPs furnished to the library by GPO.
- Ensure that a member of the library staff is knowledgeable about the use of the online repository.
- Meet other SupDocs requirements established by promulgated regulations



Selective Depository Libraries

- Provide access to selected IDPs in tangible form as provided by the SupDocs.
- Maintain its collection of tangible IDPs for a minimum of 5 years after receipt, unless authorized to by the SupDocs withdraw materials earlier.
- Collaborates with a Regional Depository Library on the maintenance of a regional collection of tangible IDPs.
- No limit on the number of selective depositories.

ø

Regional Depository Libraries

- Provide access to selected IDPs in tangible form as provided by the SupDocs.
- May decline to receive IDPs in tangible form
- Provides access to all IDPs regardless of form or format.
- Coordinate and collaborate with selective depository libraries to maintain access to its collection of tangible IDPs.
- Agree to provide services to selective depository libraries.

Options for Depository Libraries

- May receive an electronic, digital deposit directly from the SupDocs.
- Libraries receiving digital deposit shall comply with the same measures implemented by the SupDocs to protect the privacy of individuals who seek access to IDPs through the use of online repository.
- Depositories will not be required to participate in the training and continuing education program developed by the SupDocs.

Number of Depository Libraries

- Provide regulations that limit the number of libraries designated as selective depository libraries.
- Limit the number of regional depository libraries located in any state to two.
- Provide for the designation of at least two regional depository libraries in each census region.
- Any depository library may request to be designated a preservation depository library.

P

U.S. Census Regions





Transition

 Each library designated a depository library, a selective depository library, or a regional depository library under Chapter 19 of the current law shall be deemed to have been designated a Federal depository library under the new Chapter 5.



- Too prescriptive, too process oriented.
- No teeth to make agencies comply with providing content.
- Regulatory process prescribed is too cumbersome and time consuming.
- Too much operational responsibility is placed on the agencies
- Collection development decisions should be made by the SupDocs.

ø

- No provision for selective depository libraries to be digital-only.
- Preservation responsibilities are placed with multiple agencies.
- Needs clarification for the preservation depository designation.
- More collection responsibilities placed on selective depository libraries.
- Selective depositories must retain tangible materials for five years, with no provision for substitution

ø

- Voids the ability for regionals to discard tangible content.
- Education should include the public at large as well since they are also direct users of digital content in **govinfo** and Ben's Guide.
- No provision for other support services for depository libraries.
- Concern with the ability for congressional publications to change styles with each Congress.
- No operational definitions to differentiate between recalls, withdrawals, disposals, and deaccessioning.



- Changing name back to Government Printing Office
- Outsourcing of Congressional Printing
- Dismantling of the JCP
- Interaction between agencies and GPO to identify fugitives, get material into the life-cycle process
- Decentralizing agency printing
- Eliminating tangible distribution of the Statutes at Large
- Eliminating production of the Congressional Record Index



Draft Bill and National Plan

National Plan for Access to U.S. Government Information



A Framework for a User-centric Service Approach To Permanent Public Access

> U.S. Government Publishing Office February 2016

The provisions in Chapter 5 of the draft bill support the National Plan and will allow GPO to work toward achieving our desired outcomes in a more robust manner.

Ņ

Questions?

Laurie B. Hall Ihall@gpo.gov

Cindy Etkin cetkin@gpo.gov