The Federal Depository Library Program in 2023: One Perspective on the Transition to the Future

Peter Hernon and Laura Saunders

The Government Printing Office (GPO) administers a depository library program that provides the public with access to government publications, including digital ones. For years, the GPO, its Depository Library Council, and documents librarians have discussed the future role of member libraries. This article explores a different, but critical, perspective: that of directors of university libraries within the Association of Research Libraries. Thirty directors reviewed different scenarios and selected the one they envision their university assuming. The findings have implications for librarians in any depository library program and others interested in the future role of libraries as collection and service centers for government information resources.

In an analysis of how the national government informs, communicates with, and shares information with the American citizenry, historian Culver H. Smith writes:

> Beginning in 1789, the new government turned to newspapers to supply some needed services. Selected newspapers were employed by the Department of State to publish the laws, orders, and resolutions of Congress. By this means the federal government established contacts with the citizenry in the growing nation…. In addition, certain Washington newspaper proprietors were elected publishers for Congress to perform a large and responsible function and a few editors voluntarily recorded the congressional debate, thus relieving Congress of this duty.[1]

In addition to the role newspapers played, there were other venues to promote public access to news about what the national government is doing and to information generated by it. Among these were libraries, most of which became depository libraries.

Background

The depository library program, which the Government Printing Office (GPO), a legislative agency, now administers, dates from 1813, when Congress first authorized legislation to ensure that one copy of congressionally distributed publications

Peter Hernon is a Professor in the Graduate School of Library and Information Science at Simmons College, Boston; e-mail: peter.hernon@simmons.edu. Laura Saunders is Adjunct Faculty and Ph.D. student at Simmons College; e-mail: laura.saunders@simmons.edu.

(the Serial Set) be provided to certain universities, historical societies, and state libraries. Later, executive branch publications were distributed independent of the Serial Set. Legislation enacted toward the end of the nineteenth century as well as in the twentieth century resulted in a marked increase in the number of member libraries. The 1962 Depository Library Act (76 Stat. 352) created regional depositories (libraries that, among other things, are expected to develop comprehensive collections) and selective depositories (able to determine item categories they want to receive), and as a result of that public law the number of member libraries increased more than two-fold. The prevailing viewpoint reflected in the legislative history of that act is that the public is best served by having access to depository collections that are located near where they live or work. Expressed another way, they should not have to travel vast distances to visit a depository collection.[2]

In the early 1990s, as use of the Internet became widespread, government added a new component, e-government, whose antecedents date back at least to initiatives of the 1960s. According to Jeffrey W. Seifert of the Congressional Research Service (CRS):

> One of the overarching themes of e-government is to realize fully the capabilities of available IT [information technology] in an effort to transform government from an agency-centric, limited service operation into an automated, citizen-centric operation capable of delivering government services to citizens, businesses, and other government agencies twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.[3]

As part of e-government, each executive branch department or agency; independent agency; congressional chamber, committee, member, or agency; or judicial court or agency maintains a Web site that disseminates a variety of government information resources:[4] print and digital publications, unpublished records, datasets, photographic and graphic images, interactive maps and games, videos, simulations and animations, films, PowerPoint slide sets, and so on. Some of these resources might be historical and require the use of special software, which a government body might make available on its homepage. Additional content is available through e-services such as e-mail alerts, blogs, podcasts, RSS (Really Simple Syndication) feeds, Webcasts, and wikis.

The GPO, which now considers the Web as its primary means of disseminating government publications, provides a high percentage of publications digitally (more than 90%) to the approximately 1,250 depository libraries. Publications in GPO's *Catalog of U.S. Government Publications* are increasingly preserved as a PURL (Persistent Uniform Resource Locator). Furthermore, depository libraries, as well as the private and not-for-profit sectors, are digitizing government resources and making them available.

Problem Statement
In such a digital environment, the national government continues to expand its Internet services and to disseminate more information resources in a wide variety of formats directly to all segments of society (including, for instance, the nation's youth, elderly, and those seeking materials in languages other than English). Given this environment, how many libraries want to remain in the depository library program and what role do they intend to play? No study has investigated that role from the perspective of library directors—the individuals who shape a library's strategic direction and have formed an overarching picture of the organization and how the various parts of the library fit together. The purpose of this study is to fill that void by examining the viewpoints of directors whose libraries are members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL).

Although the focus of this study is on research-intensive universities, the findings have implications for other members of the depository library program, for similar programs in the United States and in other countries, and for libraries likely to benefit from the creation of new services. This study reflects the extent to which ARL libraries view government information resources as critical to achieving their strategic directions. It also reminds those involved in administering depository programs and overseeing depository collections that directors determine the role that libraries play in the program. That determination takes into account faculty and other interests as well as competing and shifting priorities and fiscal and space constraints. Further, the study reminds directors about depository collections and services and affords an opportunity to consider such collections and services in terms of future strategic directions.

Literature Review

Since the 1970s, various conceptualizations of a restructured depository library program have been advanced; however, these works do not consider depository collections and services from the perspective of the entire organization.[5] Studies on users and uses of government information date back to the early 1970s, but little research has addressed information-seeking patterns in the present digital environment. An exception, funded by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and conducted by the Pew Internet and American Life Project and the University of Illinois-Urbana, suggests how 2,796 American adults use the Internet, public libraries, and government agencies. One finding is that, "in general, more people turn to the [I]nternet (at home, work, libraries or other places) than any other source of information and support, including experts and family members." Although a majority of the respondents prefer access to government publications, as well as information about government programs, on the Internet, a number of them want to continue to receive print government publications by mail or by visiting government offices and public libraries.[6] Still, to lower printing and distribution costs, the government is reducing the number of print publications, preferring the public to depend on the digital environment.

In comparison to the previously mentioned work, a study conducted in New Zealand for its national government indicates that many segments of the public, including the business community, prefer Internet access to government information. They seldom consult (or are aware of) government portals and search engines, and they continue to rely extensively on Google™ to locate relevant information contained on government homepages.[7]

Over the years, government documents librarians writing about the transition to a more electronic depository program have emphasized a network of partnerships with depository libraries, the GPO, and perhaps the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and other government bodies. That network, for instance, included the partnership between the Department of State and the University of Chicago at Illinois to guarantee permanent public access to departmental publications created during the Clinton administration. Another partnership, one between the GPO and the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, assures "permanent public access to publications from 1977 to the present on subjects related to renewable energy and energy-efficient technologies" (see www.fdlp.gov/partnerships/about.html).[8]

At a conference sponsored by ARL on the future of the depository program in 2002, Judy Russell, then GPO's Superintendent of Documents, notes that, "within a few years, perhaps as few as five, there will be very few tangible products distributed to depository libraries, other than those that we collectively decide to preserve in paper."[9] She highlights

GPO initiatives, such as becoming an archival affiliate of NARA and preserving all digital publications entering the program, and inserting digital signatures on congressional bills, *Federal Register* documents, and all files in GPO Access (www.gpoaccess.gov).

Prudence S. Adler of ARL points out that, in 2003, the Public Printer of the United States, the head of the GPO, facilitated a discussion about the future directions of the depository program as part of the effort to "address the fundamental question that we have been asking each other since 1995. Why be a depository library when you can obtain 'everything' (or virtually everything) free on the Internet without being part of the program?" ARL depositories, she notes, "invest far more resources in the… [p]rogram than GPO does—some estimates suggest that each of your libraries spends $10 for each $1 worth of publications you receive and that may be conservative."[10]

At the spring 2006 meeting of the Depository Library Council to the Public Printer (DLC), members of the depository community were asked to reflect on the future of the program and government information. They were asked to address variables such as physical and electronic collections, services, collaboration, relationship with federal government (governance)**,** structure of program, and metadata (cataloging and invisible (virtual) finding aids).[11] The authors of those personal scenarios assume a terrorist attack in 2013; the passage of a Web, Internet, and Media Publishing Savings Act (PL 116-66) in 2019; and other fictitious developments. They even project that sixty libraries will participate in CLOCKSS (Controlled Lots of Copies Keep Stuff Safe), which is a reliable and secure system for preserving online, scholarly journal content.[12]

The DLC has advanced a vision of what the depository program might become.[13] In a companion publication,[14] the Council acknowledges that "The [W]eb has superseded FDLs [federal depository libraries]

as the primary network through which the public gains access to government information…. The public increasingly favors direct access to Web-based federal information over the alternative of visiting a local FDL." The authors of the document specify that:

> Since its inception in 1994, GPO Access retrievals have exceeded 2.2 billion. The average number of retrievals from GPO Access in FY 2004 was 1.1 million per day. March 2005 was the busiest month ever, with almost 39 million retrievals. This count does not include the millions of visits Web users made monthly to executive agencies. Past efforts to estimate use of materials in FDLs suggest a far more modest number of users and uses, something in the vicinity of 712,000 per month in public and academic FDLs.[15]

It merits mention that GPO Access does not focus exclusively on depository libraries; except for titles in GPO's sales program, it is the portal for free access to those information resources that the legislative agency publicly disseminates.

The same authors believe that there is still a role for the FDL program in a "Web-dominated information environment," but, to accomplish that role, individual depositories will have to change "what they do, how they collaborate as a community, and how they partner with government and private sector entities to maximize collections and services and optimally incorporate the opportunities the Web offers." Moreover, "upon completion of… [GPO's proposed national digital collection], every library with Internet access can offer a large current and retrospective collection of federal publications. Libraries and their users will clearly benefit from this treasure trove of content." The GPO, the authors suggest, might offer:

> various levels of participation in the depository program. This is more

than simply a matter of increasing or decreasing one's item selection rate. GPO could investigate offering value-added access or services to depository libraries as one method of retaining membership in the program. Having no-fee access to services such as the National Weather Service data could be a powerful incentive for depositories either to stay in the program or join it in the future.

With regard to this study, the authors outline three possible futures for the program:

1. "*Fold*: [Depository libraries]… conclude that the Web carries most of what their users need, that the obligations of being part of the program are too demanding to bother with staying, that they can purchase the handful of government publications they feel they need in tangible format, and… that they can effectively assist their clientele in their quests for government information."[16]

2. "*Status Quo*: [Depository libraries]… continue to collect the small number of essential titles distributed in tangible format and provide local public services for these collections and on Web-based federal information resources.… [I]n this… scenario the library role in government information dissemination will substantially contract and ultimately wither away.… [L]ibrarians continue to treat information as though it is a scarcity, although our patrons are living in a world of information abundance."

3. "*Proactive*: [Depository libraries] and the library community pull together in collaboration with the GPO, federal agencies, and other Web-based stakeholders to service the virtual FDLP [federal depository library program] collection on the Web. Some… [depository libraries] build digital collections as light archives…. Most… [depositories] contribute their government information expertise in a collaborative online user assistance program as well as continue

to support their local clientele. A few libraries—possibly only light archives—continue to manage full collections of tangible publications. Libraries are active collaborators in leveraging the opportunities of the Web to extend and enhance public access to government information. It is likely in this scenario that the status of designated [depositories] becomes increasingly moot; in effect, all libraries function to some extent as government information access centers."

In June 2008, the GPO, at the request of the Joint Committee on Printing (JCP), the congressional committee that oversees the GPO and general printing procedures of the government, published *Regional Depository Libraries in the 21st Century: A Time for Change?*, which addresses the extent to which public access via the depository program is "impaired by current or projected organizational, financial, technological, or other conditions affecting regional depository libraries."[17] One of the findings is, "depository operations are competing for limited funds and space that are also needed for users, staff, computers, and other collections. Multiple service desks within a library are disappearing in favor of one centralized service point."[18]

In summary, the literature represents various viewpoints about the depository library program and its future. Over the years, some of the library directors serving as members of the DLC and those participating in a venue organized by the ARL have commented about the role of the program in a digital environment.[19] Nonetheless, there has been no concerted effort to involve ARL university library directors in the development of scenarios that reflect their views on the program's future and to see which of those scenarios are the most institutionally viable. This study, as noted in the problem statement, fills that void.

Procedures
Scenarios
Using the alternative futures identified in the DLC's discussion document,[20] the

authors developed four scenarios as alternatives to the status quo. These scenarios project different visions of the role that ARL libraries might play by the year 2023; a fifteen-year limit was selected based on the recommendation of forecaster Joseph P. Martino, who indicates that the accuracy in predicting what will likely occur declines dramatically with a longer time frame.[21] They developed the scenarios after reviewing the ones that Duane E. Webster, then ARL's executive director, conceived for member libraries.[22]

According to Dana Mietzner and Guido Reger:

> scenarios, as a prime technique of future studies, have long been used by government planners, corporate managers and military analysts as powerful tools to aid in decision making in the face of uncertainty. The idea behind them is to establish thinking about possible futures which can minimi[z]e surprises and broaden the span of managers' thinking about different possibilities.[23]

They recommend that the number of scenarios not exceed four and that any scenario should meet criteria such as plausibility (each is capable of happening), differentiation (each differs from the others and together they offer multiple futures), decision-making utility (each offers insights into the future that help in planning and decision making), challenging (each challenges conventional wisdom about the future). The goal of this study of university library directors is to produce a set of scenarios that meets these criteria and a final one: they cover all likely situations. By adhering to such criteria, those engaged in the development of scenarios assist organizations in planning for future events and ensuring that an important area (for instance, a library's collection of government publications and involvement in e-government) is not neglected.

The following assumptions were made in the construction of the scenarios. First, the perspective of the director shapes strategic directions and the types of options that might be selected. Second, while university research libraries comprise a subset of libraries in the depository program, they have more resources that, in principle, might be targeted to depository collection and services. Third, the time frame is 15 years hence, which is sufficient to influence the strategic directions that might emerge. Fourth, by then, most likely, not all government information resources will be digitized and not all of the content of all government homepages will be captured. And, last, any option involves basic concerns such as financial prospects, internal resource allocation, philosophy, and relationships with user communities, in particular, faculty.

The first scenario, which covers both the DLC's fold or status quo scenarios, focuses on the library withdrawing from the program due to the need to convert collection space to other purposes or retaining the historical collection with minimal acquisition of new titles (either digital or print). In the next scenario, which expands on the status quo scenario, the library provides a digital feed of government information resources to its Web site, becoming a digital depository, albeit one with a historical print collection. The third scenario, which builds on the concept of a digital depository, sees the library entering into a formal partnership with the GPO, such as the one advanced in the proactive scenario developed by the DLC. In the final scenario, which expands on the previous one, the library digitizes information resources, including images, and creates content. The library functions as a center for gaining access to government information, but there might be limitations on the use of some digitized collections the library archived. The official designation as a member of the GPO depository library program could become moot.

Webster and Robert E. Dugan of Suffolk University, a former member of the DLC, reviewed the draft scenarios. Based on their comments, the authors revised the introduction to the scenarios, reworked the content of some scenarios, and expanded the primary motivations (see the appendix for the initial set of scenarios). They do not see the set of scenarios as applying to all members of the depository library program—only to the ARL subset—and through 2023. In devising the scenarios, the authors tried to avoid making assumptions for which there is no scholarly and research literature related to managing depository collections and services as well as to the effectiveness and economic efficiency of the program on which to draw.[24]

Study Population and Data-collection Process

The January 2008 roster of ARL member libraries identifies 93 universities in the United States as depositories, whose directors are neither interim nor acting. Of these, 20 are regional depositories and 73 are selective depositories. From March through July 2008, 30 ARL directors (32.3% of the population) were arbitrarily selected to review the scenarios; they come from different parts of the country, represent public and private universities, and are responsible for either regional or selective depository collections. Interviewed in person or by telephone, they were asked to make suggestions for clarifying content and the driving forces for each scenario. Additionally, they were asked to either choose the scenario that most closely mirrors their vision for their institution or craft a vision of a preferred future (by the year 2023) by identifying the most important factors to include, if they do not favor one of the existing scenarios.

Once the first twenty participants provided their commentary (phase one of the study), Dugan and Joan Giesecke, dean of libraries at the University of Nebraska and professor of practice at Simmons doctoral program in managerial leadership, individually reviewed the initial, additional, and revised sets of scenarios. Based on their suggestions, the revised scenarios were further modified and then considered by another ten library directors (phase two). Once that phase was completed, the investigators shared a draft of the paper, containing the complete set of scenarios, with all participating directors in case they wanted to make additional comments. (No additional comments were received.)

Findings

Of the thirty participants, five oversee regional depository collections. Table 1 indicates which scenarios all of the respondents favor; directors of regional collections tend to favor scenario 3 (program partners with GPO). Sixteen of the twenty directors participating in phase one selected scenarios 2 (digital depository), 3, and 4 (expanded content partner without GPO involvement). Viewed from another perspective, seven directors favor a partnership with the GPO (scenario 3), and six prefer a digital depository (scenario 2).

In phase two, three directors choose the third scenario and two support the fourth one. Of the two not favoring any of the four scenarios, one believes that all publications will be digitized well before the 15-year limit is reached, and he offers a different scenario (see the Discussion section, alternative scenarios). One director has little interest in the program as a regional depository is nearby, other libraries are investing in the program, and his institution is moving in a different strategic direction—identifying the Web sites of relevant human rights organizations in selected countries in Africa and Latin and South America; gathering and preserving their "fragile, vulnerable content"; and disclosing that content to various search engines (such as Google™). He envisions more ARL libraries playing a similar role for other areas and not focusing narrowly on the depository library program unless

TABLE 1 Favored Scenarios		
Scenarios	**Number Selecting It (phase one)***	**Number Selecting It (phase two)**
One (Shifting Priorities)	2	2
Two (Digital Depository)	6	1
Three (Program Partner with the GPO)	7	3
Four (Expanded Content Partner without GPO Involvement)	3	2

Other
   Five (Global Digital Collector)
   Six (Multitype/Regional
   Partnership)
	2	2**

Total	20	10
*Some directors like features of other scenarios but selected the one highlighted here as providing the primary framework. **See the section of Discussion offering alternative scenarios.		

its resources match the university's strategic directions.

Although there are differences in the wording between both sets of scenarios, it is possible to compile totals for the scenarios. In doing so, ten (33.3%) support scenario 3 (program partner with the GPO), whereas five (16.7%) express interest in scenario 4 (expanded content partner without GPO involvement). Seven directors (23.3%) endorse scenario 2 (digital depository), and four (13.3%) favor scenario one (shifting priorities). The remaining four (13.3%) either offer a new scenario or see their institutions going in a different direction.

Finalization of the Scenarios

After completion of the second phase of interviews, the six scenarios were finalized. The nonitalicized content results from completion of the first phase and the review by the two outside experts. The italicized content, on the other hand, was suggested during the second phase of scenario development.

One (Shifting Priorities). The library no longer considers the resources in the depository collection as critical to meeting its strategic directions. It is likely either to withdraw from the program or to main-tain a very limited role, one that enables the library to retain the resources in that collection. (If the library withdraws from the program, it covers the cost of deselection and returning the publications to the GPO.) Either way, the collection, which will not add any more paper copy to it, might be moved to another location in the library, and the freed-up space could be used for other purposes. The general public service staff will provide any services needed for government information. When such services are inadequate, the university's community will be referred to another depository library, probably the nearest regional or whatever replaces the present regional system (*for instance, a few super-regionals that collect print and digital publications on a comprehensive basis and serve an entire census region or division; www.census.gov/geo/www/us_regdiv.pdf*). In summary, the library serves as a steward for the publications it already has or declines that role by removing itself from the depository program.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are economics, a space shortage, staffing, technology constraints, and the availability of government resources readily through the GPO's portal, agency homepages, and depository library Web

sites. Increasingly, a number of library users prefer e-resources, so their use of physical collections is declining. Cost-effective use of central campus space makes storage of physical collections increasingly impractical. Operating costs, especially those relating to staff, continue to be evaluated for savings and efficiencies.

Two (Digital Depository without Content Creation). Because depository and other government information resources are critical in meeting the university's strategic initiatives, the library provides a digital feed of government information resources to its Web site, thereby becoming a portal for access to e-government information resources. The library receives, but does not create, digital content. Characterized as a digital depository, albeit one perhaps with a historical print collection (meaning it no longer selects any print or microfiche publications), the library purchases digitized collections and index search tools developed by the private sector. As a depository, it gains no fee access to selected services that federal agencies offer, such as data from the National Weather Service.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library. Furthermore, given e-government and the extent to which the GPO disseminates titles to depository libraries digitally, the library wants to capture digital resources critical to the community it serves.

Three (Program Partner with the GPO). Building on the concept of a digital depository, the library enters into a formal partnership with the GPO; typically, partnerships have been formed to provide either permanent public access to electronic content unavailable on GPO Access (current or historical content) or new services to enhance the depository program. Partnerships generally fall into three categories and might lead to the formal creation of shared collections among regionals in a state:

1. Content partnerships. Participants agree to assist the GPO by taking content, storing it, and providing public access without any restrictions on redissemination. Content might be a certain type of publication or the information resources of defunct agencies. "In the event the partner is no longer able to provide free, public access to this electronic information, the partnership requires the agency or library to transfer a copy of the content to the GPO. The GPO will then make the content available either through GPO Access or in cooperation with another partner."

2. "*Service partnerships*. Participants assist the GPO to provide enhanced services… [to users through] depository libraries. These partnerships focus on repurposing GPO-provided information or on providing other services to depository libraries and the public. These services may provide assistance to librarians with administering their depository collections."

3. "*Hybrid partnerships*. These partnerships are a mixture of content and service partnerships. For example, providing permanent public access to electronic government information and offering a service important to the administration of the depository collection or program."

Given the extent of document availability through e-government, the library wants to capture digital resources for its community, to assist other libraries in introducing new services, and to be involved in a formal partnership rela-

tionship. A content partnership includes the creation and maintenance of a dark archive, which serves as a repository for fugitive government publications. Such an archive can be used as a failsafe to ensure that a permanent copy always exists. Anytime that a document is sought, the repository system duplicates a copy. (Note that if the dark archive exists without any GPO involvement, the archive belongs in the next scenario.)

A different type of content partnership involves the library as one of the few libraries in the nation willing to develop and preserve a comprehensive, historical collection of print government publications. Serving the entire geographical area, each hub conducts an inventory of its collection and fills in gaps from the holdings of other libraries in the region. Whenever there is a request, the library lends the print copy so that the public can verify the accuracy of content. As a consequence, the library preserves, but does not create, content.

Perhaps as part of the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP), whose goal "is to develop a national strategy to collect, archive and preserve the growing amounts of digital content, especially materials that are created only in digital formats, for current and future generations" (www.digitalpreservation.gov/library/), the library—together with other partners—captures, manages, preserves, and disseminates Web-based content of agreed-on government homepages on a recurring basis.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government informa-

tion, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library. *Furthermore, given e-government and the extent to which the GPO disseminates titles to depository libraries digitally, the library wants to capture digital resources critical to the community it serves. If hub sites, or some other equivalent, however, are to emerge, Title 44, United States Code, chapter 19, will require revision.*

Four (Expanded Content Partner without GPO Being a Partner). The library collaborates with its (or the campus) center for digital initiatives on projects to digitize current and historical collections of government information resources in varied print and nonprint formats. Content is preserved and offered to the communities served by more than the local institution. Through the center, the library digitizes government information resources for faculty use in their classes (placing content on course management software) and for student research, and perhaps creates fee-based services for its clientele outside the institution. Thus, this scenario involves extensive efforts to raise the necessary resources to create collaborative projects that benefit the institution's faculty and improve public access to government information resources. *As one value-added service, the library manipulates government datasets through geographic information systems (GISs) to create new data and information for the university's faculty and students as well as outside communities.*

The library digitizes government information resources, contributes information about digitizing projects to a clearinghouse on government information, participates in a consortium of libraries, and creates an equivalent of JSTOR, an archive of digital resources in sequential order for which the library offers the entire set. The library, either alone or with other libraries, might work with for-profit companies (such as Google™) in providing access to digitized documents.

The library's official designation as a member of the GPO depository library program becomes moot; in effect, the library functions as a nonduplicative, digital government information archive,

access, and service center and does such in collaboration with other libraries and perhaps providers existing outside the library community. Most likely those libraries pursuing this scenario would want to discuss the creation of a formal partnership and cooperative venture to ensure adequate bibliographic control and public access.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library.

Five (Global Digital Collector). Building from scenario 2, to meet the university's strategic initiatives, the library receives digital content from more than the GPO. It purchases digitized collections covering resources of other countries, as well as indexing and search tools developed by the private sector. On a selective basis, the library obtains publications from the Web sites of government bodies—be they from other governments or international organizations. Most likely, the library provides a digital feed for government digital resources to its depository Web site, thereby becoming a portal for e-government information resources.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library. Furthermore, given e-government and the extent to which the GPO disseminates titles to depository libraries digitally, the library wants to capture digital resources critical to the university community.

Six (Multitype/Regional Partnerships). A depository library—one participating in scenario 3—functions as a service partner or node for other libraries in the area (such as public and school) to train staff to locate and retrieve government information—be it from the federal, state, or local level—that their communities need. The library develops self-help and educational services and materials, and it shares its resources with its node partners. In signing agreements with commercial vendors for their products and services, the library tries to represent the interests of its partners. In some cases, however, some resources may not be shared. The purpose of this scenario is to link *more* people with appropriate content and not to digitize new content.

The primary motivations for this scenario are political, legal, economic, civic, and educational. The goal is to enable all libraries and any interested members of the public to learn about the role and value of government information and to be able to locate and retrieve needed information. Because this scenario requires congressional and presidential support, passage of any legislation must compete with other national priorities and requires broad support within Congress and the appropriate committees, including the appropriations committees. It may be that the participating and cooperating libraries cannot fully underwrite the obligations that this scenario implies. Clearly,

achievement of this scenario requires strong and effective leadership from the GPO and JCP.

Discussion

Analysis of Director Commentaries

The commentaries group into the following categories: some imprecision in deciding on a scenario; a desire for digital access; alternative scenarios; an emphasis on streamlining collections and services; negative opinions of the GPO, JCP, and documents librarians; an interest in creating or furthering partnerships among libraries; and an acknowledgement of the burdens—in terms of space, budget, and workflow—created by participation in the program.

Imprecision in Deciding on a Scenario. Although the directors selected a scenario (see Table 1), some are unable to place their institution fully in it. The reasons are that they might like certain features of another scenario, they might see their institution as falling between two scenarios, or they might question the ability of the institution to support the scenario they selected on a broad basis or the likelihood that Title 44, *United States Code*, Chapter 19, will be rewritten to make their choice realistic. For example, one director would like to function fully within scenario 4 (expanded content partner without GPO involvement). Unless Chapter 19 is revised, he suspects that libraries may be unwilling to pursue content and service partnerships that do not involve the GPO. The library, he foresees, will remain in the depository library program but is likely to seek additional partnerships on its own since so much government information continues to elude capture by the GPO. Such partnerships might emerge from developing relationships with federal agencies, which he is willing to do.

Another director sees regional status as holding the library back from adopting scenario 4, which she favors. The library retains its regional status in an effort to assist the selective depositories in the state. If there were another regional in the state, she would not recognize an obligation to the selectives and would consider surrendering depository status and returning the collection to the GPO.

Desire for Digital Access. The directors prefer digital access, which aligns with user needs and expectations and reduces the amount of physical space required for storage of print documents. Several directors look forward to a time when they can "dump the print." Declaring "digital forward," one director asks, "Why should I treat government publications different from other resources?" He notes the library's commitment to e-resources as a cost-effective effort (saving shelf space, processing and other costs, and meeting user needs and preferences). He underscores that a print collection, be it in documents or other, is "dying" given the shifting information-seeking patterns of the constituency served. He points to the infrequent use of the print documents collection and to the dramatic decline in statistics relating to amount of general titles borrowed and the number of general reference questions asked. On the other hand, the number of people in the building is at an all-time high.

There is a difference of opinion about whether all historical print documents will be digitized by 2023 and whether such an occurrence will remove the need to retain legacy print collections. Several participants question who would set the standards for digitization and product quality, and they note the heavy cost in terms of equipment, time, and staff involved in creating a collection on par with JSTOR. One director, in particular, expresses a concern over whether host libraries would have any input on the preservation standards. While the move to digital access is preferred overall, directors also stress the importance of some libraries creating paper copy for backup and preservation purposes in case the accuracy of content is ever questioned. Two directors emphasize the need to archive a set of documents to be sure one permanent copy always exists, with one referencing CLOCKSS.

Related to concerns about the quality of digital access are concerns of scope. Those interviewed note the growing difficulty of creating comprehensive collections and capturing content as more government agencies bypass the GPO and publish documents directly to the Web. These directors wonder how they could cast a wide enough net to be sure that they were finding the necessary information resources that are not being collected and distributed by the GPO, or whether, after years of narrowing coverage, the GPO might try to expand its scope in the future. If not, at least one director expressed concern about "the level of effort required for access to a shrinking collection of documents." Further, some directors worried about the costs that could be associated with having to procure government documents from a private entity.

Alternative Scenarios. The directors believe that the emerging set of scenarios offers a good foundation for discussing key issues and for developing a dialogue with the GPO and other interested parties. Three of them, however, request additional scenarios. The first director notes that the university has a global presence with campuses in different countries that offer programs in such areas as business and foreign service. Given this situation, she wants to remain in the depository program and to see a scenario that goes beyond the GPO program and has global dimensions. Her preference is for digital documents, and she points out that, upon request, the library uploads microfiche to the desktop for faculty and students. The library is willing to acquire digital documents from government homepages or packages offered by the private sector. Thus, the scenario she envisions is similar to the second one but with a global focus.

The second director, who sees all of the choices as too limited, refrained from choosing one of the scenarios. While indicating a strong belief in the necessity of disseminating government information to create an informed citizenry, she feels it is no longer necessary or useful to define the depository library program by a finite number of libraries. Currently, the vast majority of documents are issued electronically, meaning that any library could and should become a portal for government information. Although historical collections are still largely available only in print, this director foresees the possibility of a JSTOR-like digitization project. While she believes such a project could be developed, she underscores the need for stronger and more aggressive leadership from the government, in particular GPO, to support and initiate the project, and to set the standards for the collection.

Most important, however, this director feels service is a more pressing concern than collection building or access. Instead of designating certain libraries as portals, as has been done historically, all libraries should have access to government documents. Additionally, libraries should concentrate on developing "service nodes," with libraries of different types (academic, public, and school) working together to maintain a trained staff who can assist patrons in finding and accessing information without the need for referrals to dedicated libraries. She envisioned a "hub of operators" or "triage of services." This system would allow for service responsibilities to be shared across all types of libraries and would focus on packaging self-help and educational services and materials. Such a system could link people to content and "make services findable, deliverable," again without relying on limited numbers of institutions.

Instead of looking at a set of scenarios that help make the transition to a new future, the third director prefers to focus on the "endgame" or what will result from that transition. Within the next 10 to 15 years, he (and some of the other directors concur) expects all government publications, both present and past, to be available digitally. He thinks that Google™ and the commercial sector will play a major role in achieving this goal. For him, the endgame will be a virtual de-

pository network in which libraries play a central role. The libraries at the forefront of the program (large public, state, and ARL libraries) will have comprehensive collections; they will acquire digital publications from government entities, preserve them, and make them available for the general public. The public will benefit from the access tools these service centers create.

One director, who disagrees with the "endgame" scenario, believes that it will take "many years" for everything to be digitized and captured, organized, prepared for general use, and preserved. She thinks that capturing the "vast" and diverse content of agency homepages will present a major challenge for scenarios 3 (content partner with the GPO) and 4 (expanded content partner not involving the GPO). She also questions digitization projects such as the one through Google™. She notes that they are only digitizing material of a standard size, whereas government publications appear in a wide variety of sizes. Further, she questions the preservation quality of the products and whether libraries will have adequate capability to view documents and appendices printed in a very small font size.

Streamlining Collections and Services. Many directors comment on the amount of space that government documents require in their print form. One of them, for instance, reports that the documents collection currently occupies 15,600 feet of shelving space, with 12 new shelves of material added each year. Some report storage on compact shelving, and one is planning on moving the entire documents collection to a separate, though nearby, facility with robotic shelving. Recognizing that cutting back on the size of the current collection might require revision of current statutory law, some directors would like to pursue cooperative collection development policies that would reduce the number of duplicate titles held among "cooperative partners."

One option proposed for streamlining collections is for a depository serving an entire census division or region of the country to retain a comprehensive print collection, allowing others to borrow needed titles. Instead of creating such depositories, there might be a dark archive that provides access to permanent copies. Increased digitization should also allow a move away from "individual, unique collections" to a framework that enables access to the same information from all locations. However, as different directors note, efficient solutions may require revision of Chapter 19.

Negative Opinion of the GPO, JCP, and Documents Librarians. The directors selecting scenarios 3 and 4 tend to characterize the GPO and the JCP as impediments to progress rather than as potential partners, pointing specifically to the JCP's refusal to support the memorandum of understanding between Nebraska and Kansas.[25] The impression is that the GPO does not provide leadership and no longer seeks to get to know member libraries and their strategic priorities. Indeed, one director went so far as to envision removing the GPO "from the equation" altogether. This feeling is especially strong among most of the directors overseeing regional collections.

Although some directors believe they have "forward-thinking" documents librarians, others feel the opposite. As the director of a regional depository explains, "the more that directors know about the program and a library's responsibilities, the less likely documents librarians can bluff about the legal obligations and seek to maintain the status quo."

Creating or Furthering Partnerships. Some directors speak of extending the idea of collection partnerships to service partnerships such as those envisioned by the director recommending scenario 6 (multitype/regional partnerships). In particular, such partnerships could take advantage of increased digital access and reduce referrals among depository libraries by increasing and improving direct

service to patrons. Some participants hint that the GPO could become marginalized if the program evolved in this direction, unless it works to develop "the service side."

Given the issues associated with economics of scale for digital storage, two directors pledged a willingness to contribute financially to a cooperative storage program. As they note, their universities are not in a position to provide digital storage, including file backup.

One director favoring the third scenario (content partner with the GPO) expresses a willingness for the library to serve the entire geographical region and maintain a print copy (copy of last resort) so that other libraries could become more selective in their print holdings. She does not favor the copy of last resort residing digitally and is willing to catalog all print publications so that other libraries know what they have. The problem is that the staff would have to conduct an inventory to determine how many of the items, including the historical ones, actually reside in the collection and are in good condition. Such an inventory, she projects, could cost up to $4 million, which they do not have; the GPO is unlikely to provide the necessary funding.

Burden of Membership in the Program. The burden of participation in the program, including that of cost, is a recurring theme. One director suggests that the cost of being a regional varies from $300,000 to $600,000 per year. The collection contains approximately 200,000 volumes, and the per-volume cost ranges between $2.00 and $3.00; this amount includes space, staff, shelf maintenance, dusting, and other maintenance costs. She also reminds other institutions about the cost of quitting the program: removing titles from the collection and returning them to the GPO.

Other concerns include the strain on budget and workload associated with occasional audits done by the GPO. Such audits involve preparation, including the gathering of statistics and generating of reports, which create "a substantial administrative cost to the institution." Another director stresses that regional depositories must review publications that selective depositories in the state want to discard. The number of items subject to review has dramatically increased as libraries prefer digital over print holdings. As a result, many regionals face significant backlogs as their staff struggle to keep up with the current demand.

Despite widespread acknowledgement of these burdens, only four directors consider withdrawing from the program entirely. They note other depository libraries in close proximity, infrequent use of the collection, and a need to convert the space to other purposes. One of these directors mentions that only congressional reports receive heavy use. Once all of these publications are available digitally, he points out, there will be no need to remain in the program. The library is willing to surrender any documents so requested by the GPO. Access to digital documents is an insufficient reason to stay in the program. He adds, "The directors I talk to all want to get rid of the [depository] collection and drop out of the program as soon as possible."

By 2023, the director believes, the library will be able to obtain needed digital documents elsewhere without reliance on membership in the program, such as directly from departments, agencies, and congressional committees, or from the private sector. He recognizes that government bodies do not preserve all of their publications and that they might withdraw or withhold titles from public purview. Monitoring this situation and seeking remedies to offset such difficulties, however, "is not a role we see for ourselves."

Finally, several directors predict that, within the next 15 years, they would cease to employ separate, dedicated government documents librarians. They assume the specialized knowledge will be passed to reference librarians. If the separate documents collection remains,

it will be an open space that is unstaffed. A few respondents, however, do see a continuation of the separate collection that a documents staff oversees.

Other Opinions. The study does not probe the value that directors place on government information. Still, it is clear that a number of them consider such information invaluable in meeting their mission, want digitization to continue, and are willing to support it through digitization projects, provide financial and technological support, contribute to a dark archive for retaining print holdings, and perhaps assist with cataloging of documents. They see the value of Web 2.0 and having metadata that will enhance public access in the future.

The Scenarios

This study neither directly addresses whether the depository program itself will exist fifteen years hence nor offers a vision of what future will emerge after 2023. To make such determinations, the set of scenarios and the corresponding interviews would have to be expanded and include, for instance, participants from the GPO and the JCP. Such discussions could identify major changes to the depository program, ones that require revision of statutory law as written in the 1962 Depository Library Act.

At this time the GPO would like to be known "as the trusted information disseminator" and as the provider of electronic documents that have "not been altered since [the] GPO disseminated ... [them]."[26] As noted in the background section, the executive and legislative branches and, to a lesser extent, the judicial branch are placing more digital resources—far more than the print publications traditionally distributed to depository libraries—on their homepages. Such developments have implications for any partnership involving the NDIIPP, as government entities often do not retain all resources permanently on their homepages, and content can be difficult to find and can be subject to removal, redacting,

or alteration. As several directors note, such activities make it difficult, if not impossible, to create a comprehensive collection.

Future scenarios might include a fuller range of activities associated with e-government, namely information access, service delivery, procurement, e-compliance, governance (citizen engagement and participation), emergency response, and e-commerce.[27] Those scenarios should address more than ARL academic libraries (other academic libraries, including accredited law school libraries; public, federal, state, court of law, and other member libraries), and they need to recognize the impact of operative law such as the cost for removing massive numbers of print documents from collections and returning them to the GPO if depository status is surrendered.

Finally, by 2023, there might be a new future that involves a decentralized network of libraries. There might, however, be other futures. Alternatives might include a centralized storage facility within government and decentralized service outlets (such as libraries) or some other unforeseen option that addresses the full array of information resources now disseminated on government homepages.

Conclusion

The type of research reported in this article has value to strategic planning for member and nonmember libraries in the program, as well as the GPO and Congress, as the amount and types of government information resources (such as photographic collections, datasets, and unpublished records) and services available through e-government, the private sector, and the digitizing projects of the GPO and others increase. Because government Web sites comprise federal *records*, the content so deemed by NARA needs to be preserved. Libraries can assist in this endeavor through scenarios 3 and 4 by identifying, preserving, and making the content of those Web sites available.

Any further revisions of the scenarios presented here, however, might incorporate print and digital resources available from different levels of government (including state, regional, and local, to name three). Still, libraries might select elements of different scenarios, thereby creating a hybrid. As libraries continue their transition from the scenario that currently reflects their situation to the one they prefer, there needs to be discussion of the "endgame." What types of services will libraries offer up to and after 2023? Will libraries or other providers—perhaps e-government—become the dominant service outlets for the public at large and local community groups?

Notes

1. Culver H. Smith, *The Press, Politics, and Patronage: The American Government's Use of Newspapers, 1789–1875* (Athens, Ga.: The University of Georgia Press, 1977), xi. See also Peter Hernon and Harold C. Relyea, "Information Policy," in *Encyclopedia of Library and Information Science*, ed. Miriam A. Drake (New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc., 2003), vol. 2, 1300–15.

2. See Peter Hernon, Charles R. McClure, and Gary R. Purcell, *GPO's Depository Library Program: A Descriptive Analysis* (Norwood, N.J.: Ablex, 1985), chap. 1.

3. Jeffrey W. Seifert, "E-government in the United States," in *Comparative Perspectives on E-government: Serving Today and Building for Tomorrow*, ed. Peter Hernon, Rowena Cullen, and Harold C. Relyea (Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press, 2006), 28.

4. The only major exception is the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of Interior. Its homepage has been closed since December 2001 as part of a court order regarding mismanagement of funds owed to American Indians (see www.doi.gov/bia/).

5. See, for instance, Bernard M. Fry, *Government Publications: Their Role in the National Program for Library and Information Services* (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, 1978).

6. Leigh Estabrook, Evans Witt, and Lee Raine, *How People Use the Internet, Libraries, and Government Agencies* (Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Urbana, and the Pew Internet and American Life Project, December 2007). Available online at http://pewinternet.org/pdfs/Pew_UI_LibrariesReport. pdf. [Accessed 4 February 2008]. For discussions of the use of e-government services in public libraries, see Florida State University, College of Information, Information Use Management and Policy Institute, available online at www.ii.fsu.edu/ [accessed 14 February 2008]; Information Use Management and Policy Institute, *E-government and Public Libraries: Current Status, Meeting Report, Findings, and Next Steps* (Tallahassee, Fla.: Florida State University, 2007), available online at www.ii.fsu.edu/announcements/e-gov2006/egov_report.pdf [accessed 14 February 2008].

7. Rowena Cullen and Peter Hernon, *Wired for Well-being: Citizens' Response to E-government* (Wellington, New Zealand: State Services Commission, E-government Unit, 2004). Available online at www.e.govt.nz/resources/research/vuw-report-200406. [Accessed 4 February 2008].

8. See "Symposium on Federal Depository Libraries: Challenges and Opportunities for the 21st Century," eds. John A. Shuler and Gary Cornwell, *Government Information Quarterly* 15, no. 1 (1998): 1–86.

9. Judith Russell, "Future Directions of the Depository Library Program," 142nd ARL Membership Meeting Federal Relations Luncheon (May 15, 2003). Available online at www.arl.org/ resources/pubs/mmproceedings/142mmrussell~print.shtml. [Accessed 6 February 2008]. See also Ted Priebe, Amy Welch, Marian MacGilvray, "The U.S. Government Printing Office's Initiatives for the Federal Depository Library Program to Set the Stage for the 21st Century," *Government Information Quarterly* 25 (2008): 48–56.

10. Prudence S. Adler, "Rethinking the Federal Depository Library Program," *ARL: A Bimonthly Report*, no. 229 (Aug. 2003): 8. Available online at www.arl.org/ressources/pubs/br/br229/br229fdlp. shtml. [Accessed 22 March 2008]. The mean cost of being a depository library is $345,000; see www.ala.org/ala/alonline/mwreports/mid2004.cfm [accessed March 22, 2008].

11. Depository Library Council, "2021: A Depository Odyssey" (2006). Available online at http://dlcvisionoutline.blogspot.com/. [Accessed 1 August 2008].

12. Amy Kohrman, "CLOCKSS Works," *Speaking of Computers: An E-newsletter for the Stanford Academic Community* 77 (Apr. 15, 2008). Available online at http://speaking.stanford.edu/highlights/ CLOCKSS_Works.html. [Accessed 18 April 2008].

13. Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, "Knowledge Will Forever Govern: A Vision Statement for Federal Depository Libraries in the 21st Century" (2006). Available online

at www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/council/dlcvision092906.pdf. [Accessed 6 February 6, 2008].

14. Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, "The Federal Government Information Environment of the 21st Century: Towards a Vision Statement and Plan of Action for Federal Depository Libraries—Discussion Paper" (Sept. 2005). Available online at www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs/fdlp/pubs/dlc_vision_09_02_2005.pdf. [Accessed 6 February 2008].

15. Ibid. It should be noted that the estimate of 712,000 users does not correspond to the source cited. That source estimates the number of users of academic and public depository libraries at 167,000 for a typical week (defined as a choice of selected weeks in the fall). The research design does not permit conversion of a number into a monthly estimate. Therefore, the calculation that yielded 712,000 has never been explained. Furthermore, the data were compiled in 1989, before the introduction of e-government. See Charles McClure and Peter Hernon, *Users of Academic and Public GPO* Depository Libraries (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1989), ix.

16. The legal obligations of a depository library are specified in title 44, *United States Code*, chapter 19, and in the *Federal Depository Handbook*, available online at www.fdlp.gov/handbook/index.html [accessed 21 October 2008].

17. Government Printing Office, *Regional Depository Libraries in the 21st Century: A Time for Change?* (draft) (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 2008). Available online at www.fdlp.gov/regionals/study.html. [Accessed 16 October 2008]. It should be noted that the survey highlighted in this report took place at the same time we conducted the first set of interviews. Some directors mentioned that survey during their interviews.

18. Ibid., 10.

19. Their remarks are largely found in documents available from the DLC and summaries of ARL programs.

20. Depository Library Council to the Public Printer, "The Federal Government Information Environment of the 21st Century."

21. Joseph P. Martino, "The Precision of Delphi Estimates," *Technological Forecasting* 1, no. 3 (1970): 293–99.

22. Duane E. Webster, "Scenarios for Contemplating Research Library Futures," reconceived in July for use in the UCLA Senior Fellows Program (unpublished).

23. Dana Mietzner and Guido Reger, "Advantages and Disadvantages of Scenario Approaches for Strategic Foresight," *International Journal of Technology Intelligence and Planning* 1, no. 2 (2005), 233. Available online at www.lampsacus.com/documents/StragegicForesight.pdf. [Accessed 16 October 2008]. They also note the weaknesses in developing scenarios.

24. One of the few relevant studies is Robert E. Dugan and Ellen M. Dodsworth, "Costing Out a Depository Library: What Free Government Information?" *Government Information Quarterly* 11, no. 3 (1994): 261–84.

25. The JCP based its decision not to support the memorandum of understanding based on an interpretation provided by the CRS's American Law Division. For a copy of that interpretation, see Government Printing Office, *Regional Depository Libraries in the 21st Century*.

26. GPO Access, "Authentication." Available online at www.gpoaccess.gov/authentication/index.html. [Accessed 8 April 2008].

27. Peter Hernon and Rowena Cullen, "E-government: Transforming Government," in *Comparative Perspectives on E-government: Serving Today and Building for Tomorrow*, ed. Peter Hernon, Rowena Cullen, and Harold C. Relyea (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow press, 2006), 6.

Appendix: Initial Set of Scenarios

One (Shifting Priorities)

The library no longer considers the resources in the depository collection as critical to meeting its strategic directions. It is likely either to withdraw from the program or to maintain a very limited role, one that enables the library to retain the resources in that collection (not have to return them to the GPO). Either way, the collection, which will not add any more paper copy to it, might be moved to another location in the library and the freed-up space used for other purposes. The general public service staff will provide any needed information services for government information. When such services are inadequate, the university's community will be referred to another depository library, probably the nearest regional. In effect, the library serves as a steward for the publications it already has or declines that role by removing itself from the depository program.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are economics and space, staffing, technology constraints, and the availability of government resources readily through the GPO's portal, agency homepages, and depository library Web sites. Increasingly, a number of library users prefer e-resources, and their use of physical collections is declining. Cost-effective use of central campus space makes storage of physical collections increasingly impractical. Operating costs, especially those relating to staff, continue to be evaluated for savings and efficiencies.

Two (Digital Depository without Content Creation)

Because depository and other government information resources are critical in meeting the library's strategic initiatives, the library provides a digital feed of government information resources to its Web site, thereby becoming a portal for access to e-government information resources. The library receives, but does not create, digital content. Characterized as a digital depository, albeit one perhaps with a historical print collection—meaning it no longer selects any print or microfiche publications, the library purchases digitized collections and indexing and search tools de-

veloped by the private sector. As a depository, it gains no-fee access to such selected services that federal agencies offer as data from the National Weather Service.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library. Furthermore, given e-government and the extent to which the GPO disseminates titles to depository libraries digitally, the library wants to capture digital resources critical to the community it serves.

Three (Program Partner with the GPO)

Building on the concept of a digital depository, the library enters into a formal partnership with the GPO; typically, partnerships have been formed to provide either permanent public access to electronic content unavailable on GPO Access (current or historical content) or new services to enhance the depository program. Partnerships generally fall into three categories:

1. "*Content partnerships*. Participants agree to provide storage capacity and user access without restrictions on redissemination. In the event that partner is no longer able to provide free, public access to this electronic information, the partnership requires the agency or library to transfer a copy of the content to the GPO. The GPO will then make the content available either through GPO Access or in cooperation with another partner."

2. "*Service partnerships*. Participants assist the GPO to provide enhanced services… [to users through] depository libraries. These partnerships focus on repurposing GPO-provided

information or on providing other services to depository libraries and the public. These services may provide assistance to librarians with administering their depository collections."

3. "*Hybrid partnerships*. These partnerships are a mixture of content and service partnerships. For example, providing permanent public access to electronic government information and offering a service important to the administration of the depository collection or program" (see www.fdlp.gov/partnerships/about.html).

The goal is to be of assistance to users of your and other depository collections as well as users of nondepository collections.

The documents staff, together with other librarians engaged in the information literacy program, assume an expanded instructional role (full integration with the library's information literacy program). Depository services, as a result, are linked to the library's general effort to assess student learning outcomes at an institutional or program level. The purpose is to measure changes in students themselves brought about by their college experience and exposure to the library and its vast resources, including those offered by government.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library.

The library is a community repository and digital archives for other libraries. In summary, given the extent of document availability through e-government, the library wants to capture digital resources for its community, to assist other libraries in introducing new services, and to be involved in a formal partnership relationship.

Four (Expanded Content Partner)

Building on the concept of a content partner, the library collaborates with its (or the campus) center for digital initiatives on projects to digitize current and historical collections of government information resources in varied print and nonprint formats. Content is preserved and offered to the communities served by more than the local institution. Through the center, the library digitizes government information resources for faculty use in their classes (placing content on course management software) and perhaps creates fee-based services for its clientele outside the institution. Thus, this scenario involves extensive efforts to raise the necessary resources to create collaborative projects that benefit the institution's faculty and the depository program itself. As one value-added service for its community of users as well as those of other depositories, the library manipulates government datasets, perhaps on a fee basis, through geographic information systems (GISs), to create new data and information.

The library also creates an equivalent of JSTOR, an archive of digital resources in sequential order for which the library offers the entire set. The library's official designation as a member of the GPO depository library program becomes moot; in effect, the library functions as a government information archive and access center.

The primary motivations for pursuing this scenario are a desire to expand the investment in government information resources (assuming that the investment has been quantified) beyond the equivalent of print publications; to advance research, teaching, and learning; to continue making an investment in information technologies, ones that will enable the community served to take full advantage of e-government offerings; and to offer more resources through the library's homepage for remote access. There is recognition that knowledge creation may require an infusion of varied offerings from government; thus, government information, mostly in digital form, is a strategic resource for the library. Given the application of e-government and the extent to which the GPO disseminates titles to depository libraries digitally, the library also wants to capture digital resources for its community and to assist other depository libraries in introducing new services.