

## In This Issue

- Georgia Depository Libraries: Expanding Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic
- Weeding Digital Government Information Resources: Considerations and Strategies
- Beyond HHS: An Analysis of Federal Resources Which Exhibit Impacts of the United States Opioid Epidemic

# DttP

## Documents to the People

Summer 2021 | Volume 49, No. 2 | ISSN 2688-125X



...where you vote as you please. Where the privileges of democracy belong to all people equally...where your government is your servant, not your master \*This is your America

... Keep it Free!



*DtP: Documents to the People* (ISSN: 2688-125X) is published quarterly in spring, summer, fall, and winter by the American Library Association (ALA), 225 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1300, Chicago, IL 60601. It is the official publication of ALA's Government Documents Round Table (GODORT).

*DtP* features articles on local, state, national, and international government information and government activities of GODORT. The opinions expressed by its contributors are their own and do not necessarily represent those of GODORT.

#### Editorial Staff:

Please see the website for full contact information: <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/dtp/about>.

#### Lead Editors:

Laura Sare, Texas A&M University Libraries; (979) 458-2200; [DtpEditor@gmail.com](mailto:DtpEditor@gmail.com)  
Jennifer Castle, Tennessee State University; (615) 963-5207; [jcastle@tnstate.edu](mailto:jcastle@tnstate.edu)

#### Editors:

Benjamin Grantham Aldred, University of Illinois at Chicago; (812) 320-0926; [baldred2@uic.edu](mailto:baldred2@uic.edu)

Susanne Caro, North Dakota State University; (701) 231-8863; [susanne.caro@ndsu.edu](mailto:susanne.caro@ndsu.edu)

Julia Ezzo, Michigan State University; (517) 884-6387; [julia@msu.edu](mailto:julia@msu.edu)

Megan Graewingholt, CSU Fullerton Pollak Library; (657) 278-3094; [mgraewingholt@fullerton.edu](mailto:mgraewingholt@fullerton.edu)

Kathy Hale, Pennsylvania State Library; (717) 787-2327; [kahale@pa.gov](mailto:kahale@pa.gov)

Dominique Hallett, Arkansas State University; (870) 351-2807; [dhallett@astate.edu](mailto:dhallett@astate.edu)

Sonnet Ireland, St. Tammany Parish Library; (985) 646-6470, x10; [librarysonnet@gmail.com](mailto:librarysonnet@gmail.com)

Angela J.A. Kent, Texas State Library and Archives Commission; (202) 744-5058; [angela.aranas@gmail.com](mailto:angela.aranas@gmail.com)

Richard Mikulski, Portland State University; (503) 725-9939; [richard.m.mikulski@pdx.edu](mailto:richard.m.mikulski@pdx.edu)

Larry Schwartz, Minnesota State University Moorhead; (218) 477-2353; [schwartz@mnstate.edu](mailto:schwartz@mnstate.edu)

Claudene Sproles, University of Louisville; (502) 852-6076; [claudene.sproles@louisville.edu](mailto:claudene.sproles@louisville.edu)

**Reviews Editor:** Emily Alford, Indiana University; [alfordem@indiana.edu](mailto:alfordem@indiana.edu)

**Advertising Editor:** Alicia Kubas, University of Minnesota Libraries; 612-624-1865; [akubas@umn.edu](mailto:akubas@umn.edu)

**Advertising:** Inquiries about advertising may be addressed to the Advertising Editor. *DtP* accepts advertising to inform readers of products and services. *DtP* will adhere to all ethical and commonly accepted advertising practices and will make every effort to ensure that its practices in relation to advertising are consistent with those of other Association publications. *DtP* reserves the right to reject any advertisement deemed not relevant or consistent to the above or to the aims and policies of ALA.

**Distribution Manager:** ALA Subscription Department, 225 N. Michigan Ave., Suite 1300, Chicago, IL 60601; 1-800-545-2433, press 5; fax: (312) 280-1538; [subscriptions@ala.org](mailto:subscriptions@ala.org)

**Subscriptions:** *DtP* is accessible to ALA/GODORT members on a per volume (annual) basis. For subscriptions, prepayment is required in the amount of \$35 in North America, \$45 elsewhere. Checks or money orders should be made payable to "ALA/GODORT" and sent to the Distribution Manager.

**Contributions:** Articles, news items, letters, and other information intended for publication in *DtP* should be submitted to the Lead Editor. All submitted material is subject to editorial review. Please see the website for additional information: <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/dtp/about/editorialPolicies#focusAndScope>.

**Indexing:** Indexed in Library Literature 19, no. 1 (1991) and selectively in PAIS 33, no 1 (2005). Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts (2004). Full text also available in HeinOnline 1, no.1 (1972).

**Editorial Production:** ALA Production Services—Tim Clifford and Lauren Ehle.

#### Columnists:

Documents Without Borders

Jim Church

Doe Library

University of California, Berkeley

[jchurch@library.berkeley.edu](mailto:jchurch@library.berkeley.edu)

Not Just in English

Jane Canfield

Pontifical Catholic University of

Puerto Rico

[janfield@pucpr.edu](mailto:janfield@pucpr.edu)

Get to Know . . .

Megan Graewingholt

CSU Fullerton

[mgraewingholt@fullerton.edu](mailto:mgraewingholt@fullerton.edu)

# DtP

Documents to the People

Summer 2021 | Volume 49, No. 2 | ISSN 2688-125X

## Columns

2 Editor's Corner—Laura Sare

4 From the Chair—Lynda Kellam

5 Review

*Outplayed: Regaining Strategic Initiative in The Gray Zone*—Carl P. Olson

## Features

7 Georgia Depository Libraries: Expanding Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic

*Valerie Glenn and Laurie Aycock*

11 Weeding Digital Government Information Resources: Considerations and Strategies

*Paul Riermaier; Will Bandoma; Sue Gagnon; Janet Marler; Sandra Standish; Victoria Turner*

18 Beyond HHS: An Analysis of Federal Resources Which Exhibit Impacts of the United States Opioid Epidemic

*Emily Alford*

## 'Round the Table

21 ALA Midwinter GODORT Committee Highlights

---

**About the Cover:** "This is America...Where You Vote as You Please" U.S. National Archives, World War II Posters, compiled 1942–1945. U.S. National Archives' Local Identifier: 44-PA-2080. <https://www.flickr.com/photos/usnationalarchives/8161388519/in/album-72157631944278536/>.

Last year I published an editorial about voting during the pandemic, contrasting states trying to make voting more accessible, with states that were fighting efforts to enable ways citizens could vote safely.<sup>1</sup> Unfortunately greater voting access is under more attack now. The Brennan Center for Justice noted as of March 24th, “361 bills with restrictive provisions in 47 states. That’s 108 more than the 253 restrictive bills tallied as of February 19, 2021—a 43 percent increase in little more than a month.”<sup>2</sup> This is very disappointing, and once again my home state of Texas is restricting access, trying to ban methods of voting that local officials allowed during the pandemic in last year’s general election. The Texas Senate recently passed Senate Bill 7, which would limit extended early voting hours, prohibit drive-thru voting, and make it illegal for local election officials to proactively send applications to vote by mail.<sup>3</sup> Here’s hoping the Texas House will stand up to the Texas Senate and not restrict the ways citizens of Texas can vote. I think it also demonstrates that the U.S. Supreme Court was premature in its 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* ruling removing the requirement that states with a history of racial discrimination in voting get pre-clearance from the Justice Department before making changes in voting procedures.<sup>4</sup> With so many states trying to restrict voting, and limit the powers of election officials, the U.S. House has passed H.R. 1, For the People Act of 2021, in early March.<sup>5</sup> This bill addresses voter access, election integrity and security, and more. Hopefully this will pass the U.S. Senate and allow the citizens of the United States the right to vote without undue burdens.

The reason for focusing on easier voting access, is because it is time for citizens to look hard at those who represent them and decide if their representatives are truly representing them, or their own personal interests. This is especially relevant to how government officials are handling the pandemic crisis and how well they are trying to protect the health of their constituents, such as keeping mask mandates in place until a majority of a population are vaccinated.

Citizens have other health needs as well as demonstrated in my home state of Texas in February. Many Texans were without power, or were under long rolling blackouts, and then there was a water shortage and many areas had unsafe water for days. To address the devastating power outages that occurred in Texas, The Texas Senate has put forward Senate Bill 3 to overhaul the Texas electricity market and would require upgrades for extreme weather, but has not allocated funding to pay for

the upgrades, and leaves what upgrades should occur to the Texas Railroad Commission, Texas’ oil and gas industry regulator that critics complain is too cozy with the industry.<sup>6</sup> This almost sounds like a repeat of what happened after the last major winter event when the Texas Legislature made winterization upgrades voluntary. Texans would benefit more if the Texas Legislature focused on ensuring power utilities are outfitted to perform during extreme weather events, and can follow guidelines established by a report completed in 2011 on how to keep the Texas power grid from collapsing rather than restricting how and when citizens can vote.<sup>7</sup>

I would like to thank everyone in the GODORT community, the GPO, and the Depository Library Council who reached out to those of us in Texas who were affected by Winter Storm Uri. It was a stressful and crazy week during an already stressful time.

**Laura Sare** (lsare@tamu.edu), Government Information and Data Librarian

## Notes

1. Laura Sare, “Editor’s Corner,” *DttP: Documents to the People* 48, no.3 (Fall 2020): 3-4, <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/dttp/article/view/7415/10229>.
2. “Voting Laws Roundup: March 2021,” Brennan Center for Justice, April 1, 2021, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/voting-laws-roundup-march-2021>.
3. An Act Relating to Elections, Including Election Integrity and Security; Creating Criminal Offenses; Providing Civil Penalties. SB 7, Texas Legislature, 87th Regular Session (2021), <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=SB7>.
4. *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013).
5. An Act to expand Americans’ access to the ballot box, reduce the influence of big money in politics, strengthen ethics rules for public servants, and implement other anti-corruption measures for the purpose of fortifying our democracy, and for other purposes, H.R. 1, 117th Cong. 1st Sess. 2021, <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/1>.

6. Shawn Mulcahy and Erin Douglas, "Sweeping Legislation to Overhaul State's Electricity Market in Response to Winter Storm Heads to Texas House after Senate's Unanimous Approval," *Texas Tribune*, March 15, 2021, <https://www.texastribune.org/2021/03/15/ERCOT-winter-storm-pricing/>; "An Act Relating to Preparing for, Preventing, and Responding to Weather Emergencies and Power Outages; Increasing the Amount of Administrative and Civil Penalties." SB 3, Texas Legislature 87th Regular Session, <https://capitol.texas.gov/BillLookup/History.aspx?LegSess=87R&Bill=SB3>; Rachel Adams-Head, "Why a Texas Oil Regulator Could Play the Role of OPEC," *Bloomberg Green*, March 20, 2020 <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-20/why-a-texas-oil-regulator-could-play-the-role-of-opec-quicktake>; Kate Galbraith, "At Railroad Commission, A Push to Modernize," *Texas Tribune*, January 25, 2013, <https://www.texastribune.org/2013/01/25/texas-railroad-commission-takes-steps-modernize/>.
7. "Report on Outages and Curtailments During the Southwest Cold Weather Event of February 1-5, 2011," Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the North American Electric Reliability Corporation, August 2011, [tps://www.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/2020-04/08-16-11-report.pdf](https://www.ferc.gov/sites/default/files/2020-04/08-16-11-report.pdf).

## Join GODORT!

Become part of the Government Documents Round Table (GODORT)!

Membership in ALA is a requisite for joining GODORT.

Personal and organizational memberships are invited to select membership in GODORT for additional fees of \$20 for regular members, \$35 for organizational members, and \$10 for student members.

For information about ALA membership see <http://www.ala.org/membership/joinala>.

For information about GODORT visit <http://www.ala.org/rt/godort>.



# From the Chair

Lynda Kellam



Dear GODORT Members,

I hope you are all enjoying the warming weather (or at least making the best of it). By the time this issue is published, I imagine that I will have spent several days sitting on my porch or hanging out at a gorge. I can't wait. I also hope by the time you are reading this that most, if not everyone, has been able to get vaccinated.

During the past year, in addition to efforts to grow our membership, the leadership of GODORT has endeavored to retain a sense of community through a difficult time. Our Friday chats have been successful with a wide range of topics from government documents in the news to a discussion of the Mapping Prejudice Project. While we may not be able to sustain the pace of the chats indefinitely, I hope we can continue to come together informally in between conferences.

Moreover, our Social Media and Outreach Committee has been hard at work building up our GODORT profiles on Twitter (<https://twitter.com/godort?lang=en>) and Facebook (<https://www.facebook.com/GODORT>). I encourage you to follow the profiles and share our information if you haven't already. We even have members live tweeting information out from most Friday chats.

Finally, we have a great program coming for the ALA Annual conference in June 2021. In addition to our usual meetings the week before the conference, we will have a juried

program and a Chair's program. We are still working on the plans for those but they will be announced soon.

My time as the Chair of GODORT has spanned the pandemic, and the tenure has been interesting to say the least. I am looking forward to a return to some level of normalcy. I sincerely hope to see you at our 50th anniversary celebrations during the ALA Annual Conference in Washington, DC in June 2022. We are already hard at work planning the festivities! If you are interested in helping out with that special event, please let me, Suzanne Caro, or Roberta Sittell know.

Lots more to come from GODORT that cannot be covered here. I am grateful for the camaraderie and conversation we've had together during this truly difficult year. I look forward to celebrating with you all virtually in June and physically in the near future!

**Lynda Kellam** ([lmk277@cornell.edu](mailto:lmk277@cornell.edu)), Senior Data Librarian, Cornell Institute for Social and Economic Research

"From the Chair" is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



# Review

---

Freier, Nathan P., et al. June 2016. *Outplayed: Regaining Strategic Initiative in The Gray Zone. A Report Sponsored by the Army Capabilities Integration Center in Coordination with Joint Staff J-39/Strategic Multi-Layer Assessment Branch. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute and U.S. Army War College Press.* <https://purl.fdlp.gov/GPO/gpo78897>.

This report is one of the first of a series on the gray zone, a “carrier concept” for hostile action, preceded by a long game of diplomacy, threats, and propaganda to achieve warlike aims without full-scale warfare. It owes a good deal to the British Royal Army’s General Rupert Smith, author of a 2005 best-seller, *The Utility of Force: The Art of War in the Modern World*.

Gray zone warfare is a new name for a concept as old as warfare itself. Kingdoms of past ages lacked the means of total conquest. All wars featured long sieges, punctuated with skirmishes, raids, ambushes and “ravaging” (i.e., burning crops, rustling cattle, etc.) Actual pitched battles were rare. England’s Wars of the Roses (1455-1485) were thirty years of political crises. Foreign kingdoms exploited and prolonged the conflict (sound familiar?) and treacherous political infighting filled three decades that, in all, saw about fifty-six days of actual fighting. Yet the English throne changed hands four times, until the Tudors cemented power, and a third of England’s aristocracy had been killed. English society was forever changed. Thus, wars change history even without massive casualties.

By contrast, *Outplayed* examines the “American way of war” or, more accurately, the American preference to

prepare for a particular kind of war.” For Americans, wars are five-act grand operas of Peace, Crisis, War, Resolution, ending with a New, Improved Peace. That is our memory of the American Civil War, World War I, and above all, World War II. However, if that is war, said General Smith, then war no longer exists. The world’s last battle between formations of tanks was in the Golan Heights in the 1973 Yom Kippur War. The 1991 Gulf War was the swan-song of regional campaigns. Since then, American military adventures have stalled or foundered. Conflicts close when troops withdraw, not when the enemy yields his sword.

All militaries mirror the nations they exist to defend, and *Outplayed* asserts that the American military, no less than the American people, acting through their elected representatives, remain saddled with four outdated assumptions: First, we will always be the good guys: our interventions will be supported and acclaimed by most of our allies. Second, that competitors, opponents, and enemies will always fight (and lose) by our rules; we win all the battles, and no one will think of a way to fight us without fighting battles. Third, that only direct conflict between large and powerful states matters; we should just let little countries have their little fights, in the words of Will Rogers. Lastly, that nation-states would forever hold their authority, without fraying from the centrifugal forces of tribes, ideologies, and factions.

On the contrary, Freier’s project team advances three far colder assumptions: We shall remain under assault by diverse and ever shifting forces; gray zone warfare will be the most common strategy; to counter it there will be a

steep learning curve to gain, or regain, the skill shown by our foes. The USA and its allies are status quo powers, who maintain the post-World War II international order. Revisionist powers, mainly China, Russia, and Iran, approve of having an international order, but they seek to supplant the USA and its allies as the author of its rules. Rejectionist forces, such as Al-Qaeda and ISIS, and others yet to emerge, reject the modern world’s order entirely and seek to demolish it.

*Outplayed*’s middle chapters examine each of these challenges in detail. They conclude by reviewing our country’s history, beginning with President Theodore Roosevelt, who made skillful use of gray zone warfare when England had the largest navy and France the largest army. We owe our privileged position in the world to generations of success at gray zone warfare. Russia, China, and Iran all learned from the “American Century,” the way Germany learned the art of “blitzkrieg” from the Allies’ Hundred Days’ campaign that finally defeated the Kaiser’s armies in the First World War.

Their closing recommendations make the most difficult reading, since the problem they address is so complex and diffuse. The theme, however, is clear: The United States must get back in the game or be relegated to the international sidelines. Military technology has overcome the barriers of geography and economics that formerly limited wars. Political and social conflict, between nations and within nations, pose obstacles as difficult as any mountain range.

Most ominously of all, nations the world over are in a crisis of legitimacy. We may be seeing an Internet effect which has heretofore passed unnoticed. Textbooks on project management have

for decades affirmed that the larger the visibility of any project or policy, the less tolerance there is for even the slightest error or setback. Easily correctible mistakes result in cancellation and shutdown amid scorching denunciations from the press and political leaders. It may be the Internet has put an end to low-visibility projects. Scandals and scapegoating now

hamper defensible conduct at every level of public affairs.

*Outplayed* is a valuable contribution to understanding the world today, useful mainly as an introduction to the growing body of government publications on gray zone warfare since 2016, such as *Mastering the Gray Zone: Understanding a Changing Era of Conflict* by Michael

Mazarr, *Thucydides was Right: Defining the Future Threat*, by Colin S. Grey, or *A Whole of Government Approach to Gray Zone Warfare*, by Elizabeth G. Troeder. Recommended for history and political science students, and for international programs.—*Carl P. Olson (colson@towson.edu) is a librarian for government publications at Towson University*



# Georgia Depository Libraries

## Expanding Engagement During the COVID-19 Pandemic

Valerie D. Glenn and Laurie Aycock

**T**hrough the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), the Government Publishing Office (GPO) provides materials published by government agencies to designated libraries in the United States and its territories. In return, these libraries offer free, public access to the materials in their depository collections.<sup>1</sup> The state of Georgia has 23 federal depository libraries—one Regional and 22 Selectives.<sup>2</sup> All but two of these libraries are affiliated with academic institutions, and the majority are part of the University System of Georgia (USG).<sup>3</sup>

The network of depository libraries in Georgia provides multiple ways for depository coordinators to build relationships and collaborate in efforts to support each other's work and to promote government information to their constituents. These initiatives include annual state depository meetings, a statewide email discussion list, and involvement in the Georgia Library Association's Government Information Interest Group (GIIG). Aside from the discussion list, most of these collaborations have been in person, which limited the ability of some depository coordinators and their assistants to attend due to travel funding restrictions and job responsibilities.

We started to explore virtual methods for communication so that more members of the depository community could participate, beginning with hybrid state meetings in 2019 and 2020. In March 2020, the sudden move to long-term, fully remote work due to COVID-19 provided new opportunities for collaboration around programming as well as relationship-building. This expanded engagement among depository coordinators is important in that it lessens the need of individual coordinators to “reinvent the wheel” when planning events. As we continue to collaborate on events and programming, it can also increase the visibility and signal the importance of the depository collections to the greater library community and local administrations.

### Established Collaboration Opportunities The Georgia State Plan for Federal Depository Libraries

The Georgia State Plan for Federal Depository Libraries describes how depositories “work individually and collectively to ensure that all residents of the State of Georgia have physical and intellectual access to Federal government information in all formats.”<sup>4</sup> A committee of Selective depository coordinators, chaired by the Regional librarian, reviews and updates the plan at least every five years.

One of the goals of the plan describes responsibilities for fostering and facilitating communication between depository libraries. Responsibilities of the Regional depository coordinator include promoting cooperation for resource sharing and reference assistance, as well as promoting communication and enhancing networking activities between Selective depository libraries. Selective depository coordinators are responsible for communicating with the Regional librarian and providing updates in staffing or contact information, significant changes in depository status, and/or significant changes in collection access due to renovation projects or disaster events. Selectives are also encouraged to collaborate with nearby depositories on collection development, promotional events, and continuing education activities for their local communities.

### Annual Meetings

The Regional depository librarian facilitates the Annual Meeting of Georgia Depository Libraries. This one-day meeting is free and open to anyone interested in government information. In the past, meetings were hosted by various depository libraries centrally located in the state, but in more recent years, they have been hosted by the Map & Government Information Library at the University of Georgia. The meetings were solely

in-person until 2018, which limited the number of participants due to prohibitive travel times or the lack of travel funds. Partnering with GPO in 2018 to use their virtual meeting platform provided the addition of a virtual component to the meeting. This allowed for more people from around the state to attend and for GPO staff to provide updates without having to travel to the state. As part of the meeting, coordinators give updates about happenings and events at their libraries. A focus of the past few years has been the discussion of outreach and promotion activities used to highlight government information and the depository library.

### US Depositories in Georgia Email Listserv

The official listserv for depository libraries in Georgia is DOC-SGA-L.<sup>5</sup> The list is open to all depository coordinators and other staff members in Georgia who work with government information. It is primarily used for announcements from the Regional librarian and for information sharing. While the list is not very active, it provides an easily accessible method for depository coordinators to ask questions and to share resources and events. The activity on the listserv has remained about the same in the past year, and it is still serving its intended purpose of information sharing. However, the listserv is an effective tool that can be increasingly utilized for effective communication as coordinators continue to work together in the future. An added benefit to using the listserv is that subscribers can search the archives to view older messages and identify previously-posted activities.

### Government Information Interest Group (GIIG)

The Georgia Library Association (GLA) offers a number of interest groups for association members to join. The Government Information Interest Group serves “to promote the use and accessibility of federal, state, and local government information as well as foreign and international government information and to provide support, information sharing, and instruction for government information at all levels.”<sup>6</sup> It is the officially recognized Georgia affiliate to the Government Documents Round Table of the American Library Association (GODORT).

GIIG provides another opportunity for depository library staff and others interested in government information to meet, discuss topics of interest, and work together to promote government information in the state. GIIG officers host two meetings each year—a planning meeting in January during the GLA Midwinter meeting and a business meeting in October during the Georgia Libraries Conference (GLC). GIIG also sponsors

at least one presentation about government information during GLC.

Because membership in GIIG is open to all GLA members, not just those whose job responsibilities involved government documents, the focus is not solely on depository library management. Discussions have included creating guides to voting and elections information, outreach and collaboration with teachers and media specialists, and partnering with a local public library who also serves as their county’s law library. With the renewed interest in government information, the current officers of GIIG plan to survey members on their interests in order to guide our programming for the upcoming year.

### COVID-19—Impact and Ideas

The 2020 annual meeting of Georgia FDLP personnel took place, as usual, during UGA’s spring break—March 10. This was only days before the governor issued an executive order closing “all public elementary, secondary, and post-secondary schools” in the state.<sup>7</sup> The closure was to last from March 18 through 31, unless extended—and later that month, it was mandated that post-secondary schools be closed for in-person instruction “with limited exceptions” for the rest of the semester.<sup>8</sup>

On March 13, 2020, the University System of Georgia announced a two-week extension of spring break, in order for faculty to move classes online.<sup>9</sup> Libraries across the state shifted from being completely open to, in some cases, being completely closed, in a matter of days.

With many depository personnel working remotely, we continued to use DOCSGA-L as a way to communicate changes in services and staffing across the state, as well as share GPO guidance regarding library closures. Libraries continued to provide access to government information in whatever format they could, dependent on local restrictions and user need. Many depository libraries in the state began the shift to a mostly-digital depository years ago, and their users are familiar with accessing government information online. Some of the USG libraries that decided to close relied on the HathiTrust Emergency Temporary Access Service to provide additional digital access to materials in their physical collections.<sup>10</sup>

As the weeks went on and many continued to work remotely full-time, the Regional Librarian offered to host a “Regional/FDLP Office Hour” via Zoom every other Friday. The time was intended to be low pressure, where people could “drop in” and “use the time to ask questions, swap ideas for new promotional ideas, or just vent about what’s going on in your library.” Beginning May 1, 2020, the first event generated one attendee, but afterward the office hours averaged 3.5 attendees, with a high of seven. Sessions were reduced to once a month

beginning in August, when most people had returned to full or partial on-site work.

Seeing our colleagues more than one to two times a year (at the state meeting and the Georgia Libraries Conference) led to a shift in how we engage with one another. While we did not always talk about library matters (particularly once it began to look like the college football season would actually take place), the ability to see each other more regularly and learn more about the challenges and successes that others were experiencing has been helpful. Hearing about what was happening at other libraries around the state provided a sense of emotional support as we navigated these immense changes, and it also provided a spark of creativity as we learned how our colleagues' pivot to providing online workshops was reaching larger audiences than ever before.

As the fall semester (and September) approached, much of the conversation turned to how libraries were planning to promote Constitution Day. While many of the ideas were too ambitious to be completed last year, we discussed ways that we could build upon local activities to broaden promotion and participation in future years. Ideas included:

- A state-wide trivia competition
- Virtual Constitution Day panels organized by and featuring participants from campuses across the state
- Constitutional read-a-thons

Our discussion about these ideas began over the summer months, so there was not enough time to organize collaborative events among campuses for fall semester. Starting the planning phase much earlier in the year is necessary. Choosing a small and easy to implement project—such as simply creating a guide to all the Constitution Day events happening in the state—could be an easy first endeavor for coordinators.

## Ideas for Future Projects

The shift to remote working due to COVID-19 and greater reliance on and accessibility to virtual meeting platforms provided the opportunity for coordinators to come up with ideas we would like to work together on in the future. Because in-person events on campus have not been allowed during the pandemic, we could think about opportunities to involve communities outside our own campuses in a way that had not been previously possible with face-to-face events.

Some of the proposed ideas include:

- Promoting and utilizing the FDLP Coordinator Calendar LibGuide to help depository personnel prepare for displays, events, and social media posts <sup>11</sup>
- Creating LibGuides modules that can be shared across institutions
- Providing a forum to bring together those who catalog government documents and the depository coordinators (if they are not the same person)
- Creating a newsletter highlighting government information that would be informative and of interest to the citizens of Georgia. There is interest and enthusiasm among depository coordinators to participate in creating content for a newsletter. Several logistics to ensure continuity, including finding a hosting site, choosing an editor, and a publication schedule, still remain to be determined.

## Challenges

While many depository coordinators want to work together more often, and we have many ideas about how we can do so, there are a number of challenges that slow us down from putting these ideas into practice. Time is a major factor. Many depository coordinators and staff have multiple job responsibilities in addition to working with government documents and do not have the time available to begin new projects or events. Further, priorities set by the library or the institution can take away from time spent on promoting the depository collection and resources.

Beginning in 2020, virtual meetings became the norm out of necessity. Many of us have experienced “Zoom fatigue” from the numerous meetings, conferences, and webinars we have to attend online.<sup>12</sup> And while the office hours are intended to be low pressure, attending additional online meetings to discuss sharing resources and event planning can add to feelings of stress or overwhelm.

Another challenge we have faced in the state are personnel changes. In the past two years there have been six new depository coordinators in the state, often individuals who are taking on depository responsibilities in addition to their existing duties in administration or technical services. The Regional depository librarian reaches out to new coordinators as she is notified, and is exploring the establishment of a “welcome packet” that could cover some frequently asked questions and direct people to GPO-provided resources. Succession planning was a topic at the 2021 state meeting, as several current coordinators acknowledged the need to “train from within” because it was unlikely that a new depository coordinator would be hired

when they left their organization. Building and sustaining a community is more challenging when fewer people are hired in to work with depository resources and instead those responsibilities are added to existing duties—particularly if the coordinator is also the library director. Exploring simple ways to support these new coordinators is an area for further development.

## Conclusion

Depositories can establish relationships and maintain communication in order to solve problems and provide the best possible access to government information. Time, staffing, and workloads can make it challenging to work with other depositories on statewide projects. The campus closures and changes in work situations brought on by the pandemic served as a catalyst for the conversations about collaboration between depositories to occur. Greater accessibility to technology and virtual programming created avenues for us to strengthen relationships among depositories in 2020 and discuss more ways to work together, a silver lining of all the adaptations brought on by the pandemic. We look forward to putting more of our ideas into practice in the upcoming years.

**Valerie D. Glenn** (valerie.glenn@uga.edu), Head, Map and Government Information Library and Federal Regional Depository Librarian, University of Georgia.  
**Laurie Aycock** (laurie.aycock@kennesaw.edu), Government Information Librarian, Kennesaw State University.

## Notes

1. “About the FDLP: Federal Depository Libraries,” Federal Depository Library Program, <https://www.fdlp.gov/about-the-fdlp/federal-depository-libraries>.

2. “Regional Depository Libraries,” Federal Depository Library Program, <https://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance/guidance/3831-regional-depository-libraries>.
3. Federal Depository Library Directory (FDLD) Profile Search, [https://catalog.gpo.gov/fdlpdir/FDLPdir.jsp?flag=searchp&st\\_12=GA](https://catalog.gpo.gov/fdlpdir/FDLPdir.jsp?flag=searchp&st_12=GA).
4. “Georgia State Plan for Federal Depository Libraries 2017,” University of Georgia Map and Government Information Library, [https://www.libs.uga.edu/magil/files/ga\\_stateplan\\_2017.pdf](https://www.libs.uga.edu/magil/files/ga_stateplan_2017.pdf).
5. Information for Federal Depository Libraries in Georgia, University of Georgia Map and Government Information Library, <https://www.libs.uga.edu/magil/services/fdlp>.
6. Interest Groups, Georgia Library Association, <https://gla.georgialibraries.org/interest-groups/>.
7. “School Closures to Stop Spread of COVID-19,” Executive Order 03.16.20.01, <https://gov.georgia.gov/document/2020-executive-order/03162001/download>.
8. “Extended School Closures to Stop Spread of COVID-19,” Executive Order 03.26.20.02, <https://gov.georgia.gov/document/2020-executive-order/03262002/download>.
9. USG Suspends Instruction to Assess Continuity Plans, Online Instruction, University System of Georgia, <https://www.usg.edu/coronavirus>.
10. “Emergency Temporary Access Service,” HathiTrust, <https://www.hathitrust.org/ETAS-Description>.
11. FDLP Coordinator Calendar. <https://libguides.fdlp.gov/coordinator-calendar>
12. “Zoom Fatigue: What We Have Learned,” *Inside Higher Ed*, <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/blogs/online-trending-now/zoom-fatigue-what-we-have-learned>.

# Weeding Digital Government Information Resources

## Considerations and Strategies

Paul Riermaiere, Will Bandoma, Sue Gagnon, Janet Marler, Sandra Standish, and Victoria Turner

*Weeding is a systematic approach to the removal of resources from a library's collection. In the weeding process, materials are identified for withdrawal in order to maintain a collection that is accurate, updated, well-used, meets the needs of the users, and is in line with the library's mission. When weeding tangible resources that are part of the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), a depository library must ensure that its weeding policy follows the Legal Requirements & Program Regulations of the Federal Depository Library Program and any separate guidelines set by the Regional Depository. However, there are no specific rules or guidelines to follow when weeding digital FDLP resources. This means that individual libraries have more leeway to craft digital weeding procedures that best serve their institution, patrons, and the community at large. In this article, we will discuss initial considerations when developing a process for weeding digital depository materials, we will examine different methods for analyzing a digital collection's size and usage, and we will review methods for maintenance and weeding of digital resources.*

**L**ibraries in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) act as stewards for the government documents in their collection. Physical space constraints and other resource limitations have long impacted decisions on holding tangible materials both in a library's general collection and its depository documents.<sup>1</sup> While the space required to house print and other physical materials provided functional limitations on collection size and required regular maintenance and curation, the same limitations do not exist for digital items. Absent such external pressures it is easier to neglect maintenance of the digital collection.

However, regular maintenance and curation are part of providing users with a useful and accessible digital collection.

The need for regular maintenance of a library's digital holdings extends across not only its general collection but also to its government documents collection. Initial considerations when developing a process for weeding digital depository materials at selective depository libraries include examining size, usage and maintenance.

## Background

As library collections evolved to include digital materials alongside tangible materials, library processes have had to evolve to accommodate this shift. The shift to providing digital materials alongside, or in lieu of, physical materials was driven in part by the efficiencies inherent to digital materials and in part by user preferences. A 2006 user study conducted on the University of Montana campus showed that “although some respondents prefer printed materials for specific types of information, users generally want to find and access government information online.”<sup>2</sup> The ease in which documents can be produced digitally has given way to more documents being produced than ever before, and “very much greater than the earlier production of printed government information.”<sup>3</sup> In 2013, the National Academy of Public Administration reported that “97 percent of all federal documents are ‘born digital.’”<sup>4</sup> Relying on that 2013 report, Representative Rodney Davis remarked in his opening statement at the Hearing for the Oversight of the Government Publishing Office (GPO) on March 3, 2020 that “most users expect to use those documents in their digital form.”<sup>5</sup> In addition to born-digital documents, libraries have expanded their offering of digital versions of print-born documents.

While there are still work flows and procedures that must be followed, digital federal documents can be added to a depository collection more seamlessly than tangible resources.<sup>6</sup> This

also means that digital documents can more easily remain in a collection, unused by patrons and unreviewed by a depository librarian. Whereas space constraints, large shifts of materials, and other circumstances might prompt regular review of a tangible collection, those same pressures do not impact a library's digital collection. Yet, libraries still "need to continue to develop, analyze, and maintain [their] online collection."<sup>7</sup>

When weeding tangible resources that are part of the FDLP, a library must ensure that its weeding policy follows the *Legal Requirements & Program Regulations of the Federal Depository Library Program (LRPR)* and any separate guidelines set by the Regional Depository.<sup>8</sup> However, there are no specific rules or guidelines to follow when weeding digital depository items.<sup>9</sup> This means that individual libraries should consider how to best serve their patrons, institution, and community at large when crafting procedures for weeding digital depository items and ensure that those policies comport with the FDLP's mission of providing free and accessible government information to the public.

## Approach

The lack of rules in the *LRPR* regarding digital weeding provides libraries with flexibility to craft policies responsive to their library's specific needs. However, without any basic guidelines to begin with (assuming there are no policies instituted by the Regional Depository), it can be daunting to craft a strategy from scratch. When developing policies and procedures prior to conducting an FDLP digital weeding project these principles may be considered:

- Digital depository collections should be developed to meet the needs and format preferences of primary library users and the general public.
- A digital depository collection should be curated so that results from catalog searches are not overwhelming.
- Methods of measuring digital depository item usage should be implemented.
- Statistics on resource usage should be maintained and reviewed in order to evaluate collection relevance and usefulness to patrons.
- Routine maintenance of the digital depository collection should include:
  - Identification of broken or dead URLs and replacement or removal.
  - Updates reflecting changes to an institutional author such as an agency's name or its role.

## Development, Curation, and Weeding of Digital Depository Collections

Like materials in a library's general collection, materials in a digital depository collection should be developed in accordance with the needs and preferences of users. FDLP libraries, which include specialty and academic libraries, may have distinctions between their primary patrons and their depository patrons that need to be taken into account. A library's general collection may be developed solely to serve its primary patrons, but participation in the FDLP means that the depository collection must be freely available and serve the needs of the general public.<sup>10</sup> For many document types, users prefer to access a digital format.<sup>11</sup> As digital collections grow in response to user preferences for digital access, regular weeding can help ensure the collection is visible and usable for patrons.

A commitment to serving user needs and preferences does not mean unchecked expansion of digital materials. Athina Livanos-Propst stressed in the article, "Developing Weeding Protocols for Born Digital Collections," that weeding projects are necessary to maintain a collection that continues to serve the needs of library patrons.<sup>12</sup> To that end, Livanos-Propst identified several principles that should inform weeding decisions, two of which were especially pertinent to government document collections: (1) "Accuracy: Is the information in the resource technically accurate and factually correct?" and (2) "Usage: How often has the resource been viewed?"

Regarding accuracy, digital content produced or created by GPO, should, whenever possible, include the GPO seal of authenticity. "The widespread use of digital technology has changed the ways GPO's products are created, managed, and delivered to users. Because many of the official publications GPO provides online are in PDF format, GPO uses digital signature technology to provide evidence of authenticity and integrity and safeguard against unauthorized changes to these files."<sup>13</sup> One should note that the seal of authenticity may not apply to materials that originate outside of the GPO.<sup>14</sup> This does not mean that links to documents without the seal should be automatically weeded; rather, links to unauthenticated documents should be replaced with links to documents that carry the GPO seal of authenticity. Additionally, all future selections should opt for authenticated documents over unauthenticated sources.

Review of a digital collection should also focus on identifying links that are broken. The FDLP provides stable URLs for many digital items in the form of Persistent Uniform Resource Locators (PURLs). One advantage to PURLs over URLs is that GPO reviews and maintains PURL links for accuracy and functionality which should reduce the amount of broken links

in the collection.<sup>15</sup> GPO's commitment to maintaining PURLs makes it less likely that a PURL link will become broken. However, broken PURL links may still happen and a digital collection will likely consist of both PURLs and URLs. Consequently, libraries should use a link validator tool to crawl the PURLs and URLs in their collection to identify and correct or remove broken links.<sup>16</sup> Broken PURLs should be reported to GPO for correction.

Digital depository materials can be made accessible to users through LibGuides and other discovery tools, including the library catalog. The increase of government documents, especially those that are born-digital, can mean that a simple catalog search recalls a tremendous amount of resources. The flow of government information and digital materials is unlikely to subside, but a careful review of digital items in a library's selection profile can help prevent clutter in a catalog. Weeding electronic resources can also reduce overwhelming results and focus a collection on those materials that are "vital, vibrant, and up-to-date."<sup>17</sup>

## Reviewing Collection and Usage Statistics

How can libraries determine the digital depository documents that their patrons need and that keep their collections vibrant? Measuring usage of materials has been a key part of the weeding process for tangible materials and continues to play a part in the digital weeding era. Libraries can use circulation and in-house usage statistics for tangible documents but measuring the usage of digital items in a collection is not altogether straightforward. There are several different strategies that may be used, and the best strategy for a particular library will be dependent on past practices of how their collection has been processed and maintained. Staffing consideration should also be considered, as some strategies are more time intensive to set up.

For many libraries running a report using their integrated library system (ILS), with certain customizations, will be the most practical method for measuring usage. For example, one method of measuring usage of digital resources this way is to generate an ILS report, sorted by the MARC 074 GPO item number field, which could then be used to target titles in certain subject areas. GPO has also suggested running ILS reports of the MARC 856 (PURL), 040 (GPO) and 086 (SuDoc) fields as well.<sup>18</sup> Reviewing the results of these reports would help in identifying content that could be weeded. Care must be taken though in looking at the age of a record, as older records may still contain current information. Unlike fixed tangible resources, digital resources evolve as agencies continue to

add more digital content to their websites. Deleting a record, therefore, may result in the discard of more information than expected.

A second approach suggested by GPO for weeding digital resources is to insert a standardized code, such as "REVIEW-2025-QTR.4", into the catalog record of a resource. This code could be inserted upon the record's import, into a local 5XX or 9XX MARC field (locally defined note fields), identifying that the resource be reviewed in a certain number of years. One advantage of this method would be that smaller sets of records would be able to be reviewed on a regular basis. However, this coding must be done when the record is entered into the catalog, not when the report is set to be run, meaning that planning and consistency is required for this method to provide meaningful results. The reviewer must be cautious to review content for collection needs, and not go by the age of the record. Some records may be old, but they are still current, such as with serial records where content is added periodically. Also, the reviewer must be aware that some items may have been superseded, but the newer document will not show in the results having been cataloged in a different date range not captured by the search.<sup>19</sup> More discussion on superseded documents can be found in the Personal Experiences with Weeding section below.

The GPO's PURL Usage Reporting Tool can provide insight into how much traffic a library is directing to a specific PURL.<sup>20</sup> PURLs are located in the catalog record of the resource in the MARC 856 40 or 856 41 fields (electronic location and access field). When patrons use a digital resource, the data from their selection of the PURL link is recorded with the FDLP. Depository libraries can receive reports on this PURL data to evaluate which digital resources patrons are utilizing from library-specified websites, databases, library guides, and other locations. You can access the PURL Usage Reporting Tool through the FDLP.gov website under the Collection Tools tab. Running this report and viewing the usage regularly allows depository libraries to understand which digital resources are being utilized and which can be weighed in their weeding decision making. Users of this tool should keep in mind that prior to 2008 GPO used a single record to catalog all formats of a title, so the PURL could be located on the print or microfiche record. After 2008 PURLs are only included in online resource catalog records. The PURL Usage Reporting Tool is easy to set up and begin receiving usage reports. The disadvantage is that the tool will not capture URL usage. It is possible to develop methods to monitor all click throughs of online resources in a catalog, but for initial steps or short-staffed institutions the PURL Usage Report may be much easier to manage.<sup>21</sup>

## Personal Experiences with Weeding Digital Government Documents

Depository librarians on the GOVDOC-L listserv were asked for advice in regard to undertaking a digital weeding project. Their responses ranged from the practical to the theoretical and highlighted the different considerations individual institutions must undertake when contemplating or prioritizing a digital weeding project. One librarian stated that “any weeding project I’d do would be focused on tangible collections due to space considerations. I probably wouldn’t contemplate any kind of organized digital weeding until much of the print had been reviewed.”<sup>22</sup> In a similar vein, another librarian responded, “What is the reasoning for deleting these links?”<sup>23</sup> Diaz suggests that, “updating born digital documents is not as time consuming as most people think once you get the knack for it.” He offered the following for consideration:

1. If you have an URL for a document, replace it with a PURL. That way GPO is in charge of updating the link.
2. If you find a PURL that is not working, look for the link on the document’s website, copy the new link and report it to GPO and include the PURL with it so they can update it in the system.
3. Some libraries have link checkers. Make sure the IT department sends the list to you every month.
4. The reason most links go dead is because the website (agency) has redesigned their webpage and moved it someplace else. If they did remove it from the website and you think it’s important, make contact with the agency through email. Also, report it to the GPO. They can persuade them to put it back on the webpage or GPO can archive it themselves.
5. Linking to the Internet Archive is better than not having it available at all. This is one of (his) favorite places to find deleted titles.<sup>24</sup>

The most detailed response came from a retired librarian, Michael McDonnell, as a private email to the author. He suggested a collection maintenance project to remove superseded documents. Using electronic resource catalog records received from MARCIVE, McDonnell and his staff created a report:

With these fields: SuDoc number; Title; OCLC record number; and the Alma/Primo location code that tells us if a record is for a tangible, or electronic title. A student employee scanned through the Excel file and noted any titles that might supersede earlier editions.

After possible superseded records are identified, students searched the catalog for earlier editions. Search results and complete records were printed out for all matching records including the newest. The librarian reviewed the printouts and decided which records to delete. Our documents holdings are recorded in the OCLC database so, when we deleted a record from our catalog, we also had to delete our holdings from OCLC.

Sometimes earlier editions were housed outside of “Documents.” Sometimes superseded editions had different SuDoc numbers. This could be because of a classification error or because they were issued by another agency. These and other issues took up more staff time. Some SuDoc number inconsistencies required waiting for answers to AskGPO inquiries that held up the process.

My documents department was tasked with reducing the physical footprint of our collection. This is one reason we undertook this project. Most superseded documents are small. We did not gain much space doing this. However, we did add to our title count of discarded documents each month. Not having records and documents containing possibly outdated information was another benefit of the effort.

If you have an electronic only collection you have to ask if you have the staff time to take on this task. At first you might find a large number of superseded documents as you clean out multiple earlier editions. But the number will fall as you continue the process. My opinion is that the government does not issue as many of these superseding titles as they did in the tangible era. Some have been replaced with continually updated web pages. Your selection profile might also make this task unproductive. And, if you are working in another environment, you might not be able to use the process as described here.<sup>25</sup>

The inquiry to GOVDOC-L prompted a fair degree of skepticism about the value of digital weeding. Some respondents shared that it can be an onerous undertaking given the volume of digital resources a depository collection may contain. For instance, the Electronic Resources Specialist at Thrall Public Library reported that there were over 200,000 electronic government resources. More generally, articles have cited the effort required, or the decisions made in managing the volume of electronic records needing review. For example, Livian-Probst discussed the decisions made in reducing the reviewing



of 100,000 electronic records to just under 15,000 records. These decisions included focusing only on records from specific years, as well as certain types of resources.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, in the PowerPoint presentation *To Weed or Not To Weed: Managing An Electronic Collection*, Elizabeth Psyck humorously acknowledged that the process is “labor intensive and not particularly pretty.” She was able to address the weeding of electronic documents only because her library had the “best staff and students ever.”<sup>27</sup>

## Conclusion

Depending on a library’s current collection status and past practices, implementing a digital weeding process may require rethinking workflows and breaking the project into stages. However, it is still possible for depository libraries to put in place policies and procedures today that will allow for effective and worthwhile digital weeding in the future. As mentioned earlier, adding a date indicator to a record when it is cataloged would allow for more concise reports to be generated. Similarly, reports that target the MARC 074 GPO item number field would permit review of key subject areas.

Ultimately, weeding a digital collection and a physical collection share the same goal: provide users with resources that are helpful, easy to find, and relevant to their interests. The general principles that are used when weeding print materials will also inform decisions made when weeding digital items, but the specific processes are different. When first starting a digital weeding project those processes can be labor intensive or technically difficult to institute. The resources described in the annotated bibliography can help with the process of setting up

a digital weeding system. Once the initial investment of time and effort is made in establishing a system for digital weeding the regular maintenance and review of the digital collection can be simplified. The result will be a digital collection that matches the print collection in usefulness and relevancy.

## Notes

1. Celina McDonald, “Basic Project Management for Weeding Government Documents Collections,” *DttP: Documents to the People* 44, no. 3 (2016), <https://journals.ala.org/index.php/dttP/article/view/6120/7894>.
2. Jennie M. Burroughs, “What Users Want: Accessing Government Information Preferences to Drive Information Services,” *Government Information Quarterly* 26, no. 1 (January 2009): 203.
3. James A. Jacobs, “Born-Digital U.S. Federal Government Information: Preservation and Access,” (background paper prepared for the Center for Research Libraries Global Resources Collection Forum: Leviathan Libraries and Government Information in the Age of Big Data, Chicago, April 24–25, 2014), <https://www.crl.edu/node/10225>.
4. National Academy of Public Administration, *Rebooting the Government Printing Office: Keeping America Informed in the Digital Age* (Washington, DC: National Academy of Public Administration, 2013), <http://purl.fdlp.gov/GPO/gpo34038>.
5. Rodney Davis, Committee on House Administration, “Opening Statement,” *Hearing on the Oversight of the Government Publishing Office*, 116th Cong., March 3, 2020, <https://cha.house.gov/committee-activity/hearings/oversight-government-publishing-office>.
6. U.S. Government Publishing Office, “All or Mostly Online Federal Depository Libraries” (June 6, 2019), <https://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance/guidance/2124-all-or-mostly-online-federal-depository-libraries>.
7. U.S. Government Publishing Office, “Transitioning Depository Collection to an All Online Depository” (February 4, 2015), <https://www.fdlp.gov/guidance-article/transitioning-depository-collection-to-an-all-online-depository>.
8. U.S. Government Publishing Office, *Legal Requirements & Program Regulations of the Federal Depository Library Program* (Washington, DC: Government Publishing Office, February 2018), <https://purl.fdlp.gov/GPO/gpo89707>.

**Paul Riermaier** (prierma@law.upenn.edu), Reference Librarian, Biddle Law Library, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. **Williams Bandoma** (bandoma@portlib.org), Business & Government Librarian, Portland Public Library, Portland, Maine. **Sue Gagnon** (sgagnon@anselm.edu), Head of Periodicals, Geisel Library, Saint Anselm College, Manchester, New Hampshire. **Janet Marler** (jmarler@ocean.edu), College Lecturer II—Library, Ocean County College, Toms River, New Jersey. **Sandra Standish** (nicke1sl@cmich.edu), Access Services Specialist, Central Michigan University Libraries, Mount Pleasant, Michigan. **Victoria Turner** (thrall2@warwick.net), Government Information Librarian, Middletown Thrall Library, Middletown, New York.

9. Ashley Dahlen and Melissa Fairfield, "Weeding Print & Digital Resources," Session, *2019 Federal Depository Library Conference*, Arlington, VA, October 22, 2019, <https://www.fdlp.gov/fall-2019-federal-depository-library-conference>.
10. *Legal Requirements & Program Regulations*.
11. Peter Hernon and Laura Saunders, "The Federal Depository Library Program in 2023: One Perspective on the Transition to the Future," *College and Research Libraries* 70, no. 4 (July 2009): 351–70, <https://doi.org/10.5860/0700351>.
12. Athina Livanos-Propst, "Developing Weeding Protocols for Born Digital Collections," *Code4Lib Journal* 43 (2019), <https://doaj.org/article/089c052c6fab48ae8b5003f45af4c1be>.
13. U.S. Government Publishing Office, "Govinfo: Authentication," <https://www.govinfo.gov/about/authentication>.
14. U.S. Government Publishing Office, "Document Authentication Workshop," (July 18, 2010): <https://www.govinfo.gov/media/authentication-workshop.pdf>.
15. U.S. Government Publishing Office, "Persistent Uniform Resource Locator (PURL): Explanation, Purpose, and Tracking Usage at Your Library" (June 13, 2019), <https://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance-2/instructions/709-purls>.
16. Donna Kraemer and Ashley Dahlen, "Intricacies of Digital Content and PURLs" (October 22, 2018): <https://www.fdlp.gov/fall-2018-federal-depository-conference>.
17. Juris Dilevko and Lisa Gottlieb, "Weed to Achieve: a Fundamental Part of the Public Library Mission?," *Library Collections, Acquisitions, and Technical Services* 27, no. 1 (2003): 73–96. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-9055\(02\)00308-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1464-9055(02)00308-1).
18. Dahlen and Fairfield, "Weeding Print & Digital Resources."
19. Dahlen and Fairfield, "Weeding Print & Digital Resources."
20. Users of the PURL Usage Reporting Tool must register a set of up to 10 hostname or IP address patterns (full or partial) for their institution to receive monthly reports of all PURL referrals from those hosts. Data is compiled through the previous day for the current month. Historical data is available for a maximum of 12 months.
21. Christopher C. Brown, "Knowing Where They Went: Six Years of Online Access Statistics via the Online Catalog for Federal Government Information," *College & Research Libraries* 72, no. 1 (January 2011): 43–61, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-68r1>.
22. Anonymous, Email message to author, November 4, 2019. Used with permission.
23. C.A. Diaz, Personal communication on listserv, GOV-DOC-L@LISTS.PSU.EDU, November 4, 2019. Used with permission.
24. C.A. Diaz, Email message to author, January 24, 2020. Used with permission.
25. Michael McDonnell, Email message to author, March 4, 2020. Used with permission.
26. Livanos-Propst, "Developing Weeding Protocols for Born Digital Collections."
27. Elizabeth Psyck, "To Weed or Not to Weed: Managing an Electronic Collection" (PowerPoint, DLC meeting and FDL Conference, 2016), <https://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/fdlp-academy-video-supplemental-materials/3609-to-weed-or-not-to-weed-managing-an-electronic-collection-captioning>.

## Annotated Bibliography

**American Library Association.** "Collection Maintenance and Weeding." American Library Association. Last updated January 2018, <http://www.ala.org/tools/challengesupport/selectionpolicytoolkit/weeding>

This section of the ALA's Selection & Reconsideration Policy Toolkit for Public, School, & Academic Libraries emphasizes criteria that should be used when making weeding or deselection decisions. It provides guidelines on creating policies to guide weeding and deselection decisions, focusing on both tangible and digital materials. Policy considerations are provided for Public, School, and Academic Libraries. Example policies for each are also provided.

**Brown, Christopher C.** "Knowing Where They Went: Six Years of Online Access Statistics via the Online Catalog for Federal Government Information." *College & Research Libraries* 72(1): 43–61, <https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-68r1>

The author provides general background on the GPO's transition to digital materials, with a focus on Colorado depository libraries and the author's own library at the University of Denver. The primary focus is an analysis and evaluation of the data collected from Denver's URL click-through tracking initiative that added a tracking prefix to every government document URL in their OPAC.

**Dahlen, A.** "FDLP PURL Usage Report—Analyzing Usage of Digital FDLP Resources." Video file, June 12, 2019, <https://>

[www.fdlp.gov/fdlp-purl-usage-report-analyzing-usage-of-digital-fdlp-resources](http://www.fdlp.gov/fdlp-purl-usage-report-analyzing-usage-of-digital-fdlp-resources)

This recording of a 2019 FDLP Academy webinar introduces the basics of PURLs and goes into detail on how to set up the PURL Usage Reporting Tool to track usage data. The webcast also discusses how to work with usage reports to understand what materials are being used and how users are locating those materials.

**Dahlen, A., & Fairfield, M.** “Weeding Print & Digital Resources.” Session, 2019 Federal Depository Library Conference, Arlington, VA, October 22, 2019. <https://www.fdlp.gov/fall-2019-federal-depository-library-conference>

This program from the Fall 2019 Federal Depository Library Conference, which includes the accompanying slide deck, focuses on the process of weeding print depository collections. Methods to weed digital collections are discussed including running reports on your ILS and adding MARC notes. Suggestions were also given regarding reviewing links and finding aids that direct to digital materials.

**FDLP.** “Weeding a Depository Collection.” FDLP Requirements and Guidance. Last updated August 26, 2019, <https://www.fdlp.gov/requirements-guidance/guidance/30-weeding-a-depository-collection>

This GPO guidance explains the rules and regulations governing the weeding of tangible depository collections. The three ways that tangible depository materials qualify for weeding are discussed in detail.

**Livanos-Propst, A.** “Developing Weeding Protocols for Born Digital Collections.” *Code4Lib Journal* 43 (2019), <https://doaj.org/article/089c052c6fab48ae8b5003f45af4c1be>

The author describes the process used to weed over 14,000 digital items in a free collection of classroom-ready educational resources. The weeding project is described in detail, providing assessment criteria, review of compiled assessment data, and policies implemented to maintain a vibrant, usable collection.

**Psyck, E.** “To Weed or Not to Weed: Managing an Electronic Collection.” Session, DLC Meeting and FDL Conference, 2016, <https://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/outreach/events/depository-library-council-dlc-meetings/2016-meeting-proceedings/2016-dlc-meeting-and-fdl-conference/2778-to-weed-or-not-to-weed-managing-an-electronic-collection-slides>

The author, a Government Documents Librarian, outlines some pros and cons of weeding electronic documents in this short PowerPoint presentation. She cites four steps in this process.

**Sare, L.** “Weeding in the Digital Age,” Session, DLC Meeting and FDL Conference, 2015, <https://www.fdlp.gov/file-repository/outreach/events/depository-library-council-dlc-meetings/2015-meeting-proceedings-1/2015-dlc-meeting-and-fdl-conference/2626-weeding-in-the-digital-age>

This presentation focuses on how to identify print material that should be weeded and identifies criteria to consider when evaluating whether an item should be weeded.

# Beyond HHS

## An Analysis of Federal Resources Which Exhibit Impacts of the United States Opioid Epidemic

Emily Alford

In recent years, the opioid crisis across the United States has influenced the research of many professional fields. Widely known as a first stop information source for analysts and professionals in the medical and public health worlds, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) gathers and presents extensive data on prescription rates and overdose numbers to the public. However, the opioid crisis is a collective matter. It holds cause and effect economically, environmentally, and socially. This article explores resources developed by federal departments *outside* of HHS, which provide useful data and information relevant to their fields on such impacts. Departments such as Agriculture, Education, Labor, Housing and Urban Development—even the General Services Administration—make available statistics both the public and researchers can access to learn more about the effects of this crisis.

### Background

Public health, financial and social impacts have all been felt from opioid addiction and misuse. This crisis has been made up of not only prescription pain medications, but also heroin and synthetic opioids like fentanyl. Prescription rates began to soar toward the end of the 1990s when medical professionals were instructed by pharmaceutical companies that addiction was not a concern, and three decades later, in 2017 the United States reported nearly 1.7 million people with prescription pain reliever related substance use disorders.<sup>1</sup>

This same year, President Trump issued the Memorandum on Combatting the National Drug Demand and Opioid Crisis,<sup>2</sup> which stated:

It shall be the policy of the United States to use all lawful means to combat the drug demand and opioid crisis currently afflicting our country. Additionally,

the heads of executive departments and agencies, as appropriate and consistent with law, shall exercise all appropriate emergency authorities, as well as other relevant authorities, to reduce the number of deaths and minimize the devastation the drug demand and opioid crisis inflicts upon American communities.

The Department of Health and Human Services was not the only sector called on to address the crisis. Rather, each executive department received instructions to respond. Some departments have utilized HHS data to analyze their own interests, while others have developed their own sets of information. Americans can now access to better advise their professions, families and communities.

### Examination

Described here are such resources available from a spread of United States executive agencies, outside of HHS, which either focus on or incorporate impacts of the opioid crisis.

#### NCES Indicators of School Crime and Safety ([nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/crimeindicators))

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) is part of the Department of Education and is responsible for the gathering of United States education data and information. NCES assembles and publishes a variety of online tools including *DataLab*, *College Navigator*, *Digest of Education of Statistics*, and *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*. The Institute of Education Sciences and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, housed in the United States Department of Justice, also contribute to *Indicators of School Crime and Safety*. This annual report depicts indicators on student safety and school crime which are gathered from surveys of students, educators as well as institutions

themselves. Notable indicators include students' reports of safety and security measures observed at school, discipline problems reported by public schools, and even statistics such as criminal incidents at postsecondary institutions. Most relevant to those studying the opioid crisis are the statistics reported on illegal drug availability and the prevalence of mental health services provided by public schools. Key findings, tables, figures, and of course a downloadable copy of the most recent publication are available through the NCES website.

### ERIC ([eric.ed.gov](http://eric.ed.gov))

Another significant resource from the Department of Education is ERIC, the Education Resources Information Center. ERIC is an online research database containing journal publications, grey literature as well as book sources and is provided by the Institute of Education Sciences for both researchers and the general public. Users can search by date, source or publication type. The search result list can then be narrowed down to examine publications about a particular policy or location. Topics tend to focus on education-related matters, but vary within the field, including case studies highlighting specific communities, postsecondary opinion on illegal use of prescription drugs, needle and syringe programs, and reflections pertained for parents of students suffering from opioid use disorder. Many publications included on ERIC are peer-reviewed, and if desired, the user is able to differentiate and select only these to appear in the search results.

### ROSA P ([rosap.ntl.bts.gov](http://rosap.ntl.bts.gov))

ROSA P, named for Rosa Parks, is the National Transportation Library's Repository and Open Science Access Portal. Accessible to transportation researchers as well as the general public, ROSA P contains full-text journal articles, technical reports and datasets on a variety of transportation topics, particularly those from state departments of transportation and USDOT. Users can access fact sheets on drugs and human performance, observations of the current state of knowledge of drug-impaired driving, summaries on law enforcement attitudes on traffic safety, and other resources and information significant to those interested in transportation matters related to the opioid crisis.

### HUD User ([huduser.gov](http://huduser.gov))

HUD User is a resource provided by the Office of Policy Development and Research (PD&R) of the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), which explores and makes available information on market conditions, community development matters and housing needs. The primary objective of PD&R is to present unbiased, raw data and information to aid

policy makers using a variety of approaches and viewpoints. HUD User is also available to the general public and helps users retrieve government publications and data sets on planning, development and technology. While not a direct source of opioid prescription or overdose mortality rates like other resources included here, HUD User provides a distinct platform for users studying housing effects of the crisis. Those researching impacts of the opioid crisis can access information on drug and criminal history restrictions for those seeking public housing, along with a widespread amount of case studies on supportive programs from specific communities.

### The National Opioid Misuse Community Assessment Tool ([opioidmisusetool.norc.org](http://opioidmisusetool.norc.org))

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development programs teamed up with the National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago's Walsh Center for Rural Health Analysis to create the Community Assessment Tool. This resource provides overdose mortality rates by county with comparison features on social determinants. In addition to the ability to compare by location, users can visualize periodic changes in this data. A county-level prosperity index was added in June 2020. This is determined by county using indicators identified as social resilience, economic resilience, social risk or economic risk and ultimately allows the user to apply this tool to improve public health programs by being aware of such indicators. The Community Assessment Tool highlights certain selectors, such as injury-prone employment and substance use and mental health facilities, which may have direct correlation with overdose rates. Users can also factor in educational attainment, broadband access, household income and other determinants as well as pull up overdose mortality fact sheets on either the county or state level.

### Bureau of Labor Statistics ([bls.gov](http://bls.gov))

The Bureau of Labor Statistics gathers and makes available data significant to prospective workers, employers, as well as researchers and the general public. Included in this data are numbers on state occupational injuries and illnesses, productivity and costs, as well as worker characteristics. A major resource provided by the Bureau of Labor Statistics is the Occupational Outlook Handbook, which provides job outlook, pay and state and local data on employment areas that relate to the health and social impacts of the opioid crisis. Researchers of the crisis can find numbers on job growth in fields such as substance abuse, behavioral disorder and mental health counselors, as well as police and medical physicians.

## Collaborations

An assortment of federal agencies contributes to the ability of the public to interact with data integral to them as educators, parents, scholars, policy makers and community members. Additionally, multiple agencies have collaborated on several projects, which provide useful resources. Youth.gov (www.youth.gov), for instance, includes community asset assessment tools, funding information, maps and program details developed by a number of agencies across the federal government. Benefits.gov (www.benefits.gov) is an electronic platform containing explanations on benefit eligibility and application instructions. Incorporated are easily searched and discovered grants for substance abuse, prevention and treatment grants, as well as existing federally funded research on the crisis.

## Conclusion

Each resource above showcases integral information on at least one aspect of the opioid crisis and its effects. It is not merely convenient that departments outside HHS provide resources to the public regarding the opioid crisis. It is imperative, as the

crisis goes well beyond public health. Educational, financial and community impacts all interact for this topic. This type of holistic approach to federally collected information, especially in e-government, is vital to a free and open government.

**Emily Alford** (alfordem@indiana.edu), Head of Government Information, Maps & Microform Services, Indiana University

## Notes

1. Center for Behavioral Health Statistics and Quality (CBHSQ). 2017 National Survey on Drug Use and Health: Detailed Tables. Rockville, MD: Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; 2018.
2. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, *Memorandum on Combatting the National Drug Demand and Opioid Crisis* DCPD-201700788 (October 26, 2017).

# ALA Midwinter GODORT Committee Highlights

## Education Committee Meeting Summary

The Education Committee met to discuss ongoing work on the Voting & Election Toolkits, Racism in Government research guide, and Help! I'm an Accidental Government Librarian webinar series. It was agreed that the Education Committee would solicit volunteers to help maintain and update the Voting & Election Toolkits and a Google Form would be created for users of the toolkits to suggest changes. Work on the tentatively titled Racism in Government research guide will restart this winter with a focus on federal government documents related to voting. The working group on that guide will meet to chart a course forward.—*Kian Flynn, Chair, Education Committee*

## Legislation Committee Meeting Summary

The Legislation Committee discussed GPO's proposed revisions to Title 44, including potential impact on the FDLP. The Committee also reviewed a two-page overview of the FDLP created by GPO to communicate with Members of Congress, and discussed possible strategies for GODORT to improve support for advocacy. Additionally, the Committee discussed an initial draft proposal to initiate a GODORT preservation grant program. —*Shari Laster, Chair, Legislation Committee*

## Cataloging Committee Meeting Summary

1. Motion to approve the November 4, 2020 Virtual Meeting minutes—motioned by Scott Matheson, seconded by Stephen Kharfen, approved.

2. Library Services & Content Management Update (Stephen Kharfen, GPO)
  - a. Gave summary of the LCSM update posted to FDLP.gov.
3. Marcive Update (Jim Noel, Marcive, Inc. / CRDP)
  - a. Rolling out about 40 new CRDP participants
  - b. National Institute of Standards and Technology NIST records were brought in for other Marcive customers, about ½ so far as files are very large.
  - c. Updated PURLs for changed or new records
4. Library of Congress Update (Dawn Rapoza, LC)
  - a. Crawled more sties and added records for State Government documents and the U.S. web archives project.
5. Chair Andie Craley noted the updates she sent to Technology Committee.
6. Chair Andie Craley gave Steering Committee Updates
7. Updates on the 3 Cataloging Toolbox LibGuides—<https://godort.libguides.com/cataloging> (Andrea Morrison, chair of working group)
  - a. Updates on release for Cataloging Toolbox for State Government Information
    - i. Andrea M. received emails of information from State Documents Collaborative —Group
    - ii. Looking for someone who can work so there is no duplication in the State Government Information LibGuide and other places, would like to make progress by July, contact Andrea M (amorriso@

indiana.edu). Jim Noel (jnoel@marcive.com) can also update the LibGuides.

- b. Update on Accessibility—Simon Healey
  - i. Still working through the LibGuides checking on accessibility, no glaring errors so far on SpringShare. Simon is using WAVE accessibility evaluation tool and must check page-by-page.
  - ii. Looking for a best practice document that academic libraries use, will research, Lynda Kellam checked with her institution and shared a document.
  - iii. Simon to put out a request for information on Accessibility Interest Group to RUSA, CORE, ACRL.
8. RDA Cataloging Standard Update & CC: DA Report—RDA: Resource Description and Access (Cate Kellett)
  - a. No new report, Cate's first meeting as CC:DA Liaison will be February 5, posted to meeting chat the upcoming CC:DA meetings scheduled: Feb 5 from 2-4 PM EST; Feb 9 from 11AM-1 PM EST; Feb 12 from 1-3 PM EST.
  - b. Committee member Andrea Morrison noted the new RDA Toolkit has been published as of December 15, 2020, but the LCC PCC (Program for Cooperative Cataloging) policy statements have not been created yet for training purposes. Meeting attendee Eva Sorrell noted in chat that PCC implementation

will not be before July 2022.

Andrea M. asked Dawn Rapoza if there is any updated PTCP training.

- c. GPO's Stephen Kharfen gave link for GPO formed RDA3 Study Group: <https://www.fdlp.gov/project-list/the-new-version-of-resource-description-and-access-rda-gpo-s-preparations-and-impacts-on-the-fdlp-community>
  - d. Committee member Simon Healey wondered if overall ALA CORE could help more with RDA training—perhaps in their cataloging and RDA webinars: <http://www.ala.org/alcts/confevents/upcoming/webinar/cat>
9. Old Business
- a. Action Items
    - i. Updates on Committee organizing or promoting already existing webinars or tutorials on cataloging Federal Documents, on weeding SuDocs, etc.

- ii. Final revision to the survey questions to be inputted into a Google Forms survey

- iii. Chair Andie C. working to upload and organize Cataloging Committee documents that I have when I came on board in 2019 to a GODORT Cataloging Google Drive and to follow-up that past agendas and minutes are posted to the webpage by the Technology committee.

10. New Business

- a. Michael Alguire has taken James Rodgers's open 2020-21 position on the Cataloging Committee.
- b. Chair Andie C. sent Committee members link to GODORT Cataloging Committee Google Drive where minutes will be stored. Committee members confirmed they are able to access it.
- c. Creating possible GODORT Friday chat topics, suggested at November 4th meeting—more follow-up? Discussion on various topics to continue via emails

and probably at next committee meeting.

- d. Consider putting together a proposal for GPO based on their 11/23/20 email to FDLP with regards to “Teach the FDLP Community Your Library’s Workflows for Federal Publications”?

11. Announcements

- a. Updates about programs and sessions at ALA Midwinter Virtual 2021 and CORE Virtual Summit and an OCLC Cataloging Community Virtual Meeting.
- b. Andrea Morrison would like to work with someone together for an article for DttP on the new RDA Toolkit, anyone on committee please contact Andrea M. Seek committee help first, then perhaps Lynda Kellam could put a message out on GODORT Connect for interest.

—*Andie Craley, Chair, Cataloging Committee*