

REGIONAL MEETING

**2002 Federal Depository Library Conference
October 20, 2002
8:30am-3:15 pm
Rosslyn, VA**

John Phillips (Oklahoma State University) and Dan Barkley (University of New Mexico) conducted the meeting.

John welcomed the attendees. He asked for volunteers to plan and conduct the spring regional meeting to be held in Reno, NV in April 2003. Maureen Olle (Louisiana State University) and Kathy Hale (State Library of Pennsylvania) volunteered.

Dan suggested that regionals consider forming committees to work on projects, issues, etc. between the regional fall and spring meetings.

Minutes of the regional meeting held at the Federal Depository Library Council April 21, 2002 in Mobile, AL were distributed. These and all future minutes will be available on the Regional Federal Depository Libraries homepage.

Introductions:

John asked each attendee to introduce himself/herself and to give a short overview of what is happening in his/her regional. The following was reported:

- Budget cuts
- State plans (creating/ revising/voting)
- Reorganization of documents departments/service areas
- New directors/administration
- Transitions/migrating systems
- Construction/remodeling/renovation projects
- Storage facilities
- Recovering from disasters (LSU and BPL)
- Retirements
- Inspections
- Space problems

Specific information of interest:

- University of Wisconsin/Madison is new regional in Wisconsin replacing the Wisconsin Historical Society as of October 1, 2002.
- Regionals in Kentucky and Tennessee are establishing a complete collection of the Serial Set.
- University of Kansas is investigating a selective housing agreement with Kansas State University for the US Department of Agriculture documents.

- Washington State Library is downsizing its collection and investigating selective housing arrangements for some of its collection.
- Arlene Weible from the Washington State Library has accepted a position at the University of North Texas

There were 34 regionals or representatives from regionals, 6 GPO staff members and 8 visitors in attendance.

Regional Homepage (Ann Marie Sanders /Library of Michigan):

Site has migrated to Michigan Electronic Library. State has no control over this new site. Site has new front page (copy distributed). URL changed to: <http://mel.org/fdlp/regional.html> Redirect is in place.

Please continue to send corrections, new information, etc. to Ann Marie for inclusion on the homepage.

Regional Retreat (John Phillips):

One held in St. Paul in 1980. Last one held in 1997 in Minneapolis with focus on the transition to electronic government information.

During past several regional meetings there have been many important issues discussed with not enough time provided to fully address each one. The consensus is that the regionals need a meeting where they can discuss and resolve issues and concerns

Suggestions for meeting:

- Clear agenda and goals
- Focus:
 - What regionals can do for GPO
 - What GPO can do for regionals?
 - Formation of partnerships between GPO and regionals

Consensus was not to hold longer regional meetings during time of Depository Library Council and/or Federal Depository Library Conference.

Julie Wallace (University of Minnesota) volunteered Minnesota as site for the next retreat.

GPO and representatives from regionals need to be involved in planning this retreat. Sandee McAninch (University of Kentucky), Bill Sudduth (University of South Carolina, Michael Ragen (Illinois State Library) and Julie Wallace (University of Minnesota) volunteered to begin planning for the retreat with a report to regionals on their progress at the regional spring meeting in April 2003.

Gil Baldwin (GPO) commented that the 1997 meeting took approximately 18 month to plan and cost approximately \$50,000.

John as a member of the DLC will ask Council to make a recommendation to GPO to plan, organize and fund this retreat.

Inspections (Robin Haun-Mohamed/GPO):

Robin has full staff of 4 inspectors. Two inspectors are still in training and will be going on inspection trips with Robin to depositories in Michigan and Pennsylvania.

Robin needs depositories in DC area to volunteer for new inspectors to do solo inspections. These depositories would not have to do a self-study evaluation.

All self-studies for Michigan, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania have been reviewed. Self-studies are now being requested from California and Arkansas depositories. Self-studies being requested are from depositories last inspected in 1994.

One inspector can review 3 self-studies per week. Currently inspectors read the self-study, review the depository library's web site and the documents web site.

Approximately 40% of depositories completing self-studies are inspected. All depositories not returning biennial surveys are automatically scheduled for an inspection.

Auditors at GPO are looking at many issues including review of LPS and depository services staff to determine if there are sufficient inspectors to meet the goals of the program, review of the self-study process, and review of the position of the library inspectors to ascertain if the library is in compliance with the Instructions. Should the inspection program as it exists possibly be changed—that the inspectors who now perform a compliance inspection role migrate to a consultant role, with onsite inspections done by GPO auditors.

Robin indicated that GPO is considering revamping the self-study program and will wait for comments, recommendations, etc. from the auditors before proceeding with this idea.

Adding New Selectives (Robin):

Five new depositories added in past few years. Currently 1293 depositories.

All regionals need to send to Robin a list of depositories in their states with their Congressional District designations—include the old and new districts if applicable. Deadline: Spring Council meeting in April 2003.

Dropping Selectives (Robin):

GPO is considering procedures that would slow down process for dropping depository status. Some suggestions are:

- Depository sends letter of intent to drop depository status to Superintendent of Documents **before** final decision is made.
- Depository notifies congressional representative or staff member of intent to drop depository status.
- Depository seeks advice from other depositories in its congressional district.
- Standardize procedures used by regionals in this process.
- Establish time period for regionals to work with depository interested in dropping its status and require regional to provide advice and assistance during this process.

Reasons given for dropping depository status:

- Save money
- Save space
- Item selection rate too high
- Do not want to select electronic products
- Do not want to provide equipment to access electronic products or Internet
- Change in administration
- Change in mission of library/institution

Question: What are the roles of GPO and the regionals in the decision or process of dropping depository status?

Dan is chair of the Subcommittee on Attrition and Retention (SOAR) of the DLC's Operations Committee. Preliminary report from SOAR is available. SOAR will be examining what regionals can do to prevent depositories from leaving FDLP. SOAR will develop action items for DLC.

Discussion included:

- Look at geographical impact
- Library directors are looking at drop rate—everyone else doing it
- Look at library administration
- Letter to GPO requesting permission to drop depository status, then GPO would send survey/questionnaire asking for reasons
- Requirement for regionals to visit depository libraries every XX years. Regionals would need support/funds from their library administrations to do this
- GPO could work with library directors/library administrators of those depositories considering dropping depository status
- Depositories need to promote FDLP and its benefits
- Need to contact congressional representative before decision is made

What Can GPO Do to Help Regionals (John and Robin):

- GPO needs to clarify/support importance of regionals and to describe advantages of being a regional
- Identify ARL directors who are advocates of FDLP. Note: Not all ARL are regionals
- Are regional responsibilities too big?
- Need more regionals or shared regionals
- Need stronger regionals
- Can regionals do things better
- Regionals need more flexibility—dealing with old procedures and new technologies
- Hard to justify regional responsibilities with budget cuts
- Regionals need good marketing tools

- How does regional fund its regional responsibilities?
- Why is there no GPO funding for regionals?
- Publicize fact that GPO supports “shared” regional responsibilities
- Emphasize that regional serves entire state
- Regionals that serve more than one state need additional support

Regional-L and Survey of Regionals (Bill Sudduth/University of South Carolina):

Please let Bill know of any changes in your e-mail addresses for Regional-L.

Bill will have survey up shortly on his web page. Some regionals have not completed this. **Please do so.**

State Plans Update: General Discussion (Dan):

Updates concerning various state plans.

Need to send state plan to congressional representatives, state library, etc.

Send drafts, final versions, documentation, etc. of state plan process to

Ann to put on regional homepage

Can federal and state documents be included one state plan?

Up to state to decide

Electronic Discard Lists (Ann and Marianne Ryan/University of Maryland):

Ann:

- Michigan Selectives weed in specific SuDocs classifications on set schedule
- Working on electronic discard list system to save staff time, etc.
List submitted would be automatically checked against catalog but not all holdings are in online catalog
- Library of Michigan has known missing list
- Automatically check documents published prior to 1950 (fire in library)

Marianne:

- Working through backlog of disposal lists
- Now have web based needs and offers list
- Presentation “Needs and Offers Database” made by Eric Dahlen
Power point of this to be sent to Ann for regional homepage.

Discussion concerning needs and offers:

Many depositories using GOVDOC-L to list offers and not **Needs and Offers** which was created for this purpose.

Why are depositories using GOVDOC-L and not **N&O**?

Recent or “hot” document that is duplicate to GOVDOC-L for faster distribution

Longer lists to **N&O**

Use both lists?

Do depositories need guidelines or guidance from regionals concerning use of these resources?

Someone searching Goggle finds depository web site containing lists of documents for disposition and request one. How do you handle?

- If going to a library, this would probably be OK. If person wants sell the document, then probably not. Question for GPO Counsel.

Submitted by:

Susan C. Field

University of Georgia Library

scfield@arches.uga.edu

25 November 2002

Reviewed by: John Phillips, Dan Barkley and Robin Haun-Mohamed