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"Firms with the largest available stocks of information and knowledge are most likely to create new knowledge predominantly through the level of comprehensiveness and creativity of their decision-making. What is interesting is that information stocks are more important to new knowledge creation than knowledge stocks."


Library - A system of professional services and relationships that provides access to needed information regardless of topic, format, source, location or prior knowledge of its existence.

INTRODUCTION

Increasing demands on transportation facilities in difficult economic times require the creation of new knowledge to improve the efficiency of existing transportation systems. As the study that provides the quotation at the top of this page demonstrates, information stocks are the most critical element in creating new knowledge. There is a growing awareness in the transportation community that its information stocks are not adequately managed. This has led to a corresponding increase in interest in finding better means of managing information resources to improve the value derived from them. Libraries and the services provided by librarians will play a vital role in this effort.

This survey is the first attempt at a comprehensive study of libraries serving state departments of transportation in the U.S. It was initiated by librarians providing services to state DOTs primarily to gather information to assist planning the development of regional, resource-sharing transportation library networks to improve access to information resources needed by transportation practitioners and policy makers. Some questions were included in the survey at the request of the TRB project manager for the policy study, "Future Strategy for Transportation Information Management."

Due to the general lack of libraries serving the transportation community there is considerable confusion within DOTs about what a library is and what services can be provided by librarians. As a result, the responses to this survey reflect a rather cavalier treatment of libraries serving DOTs. This is reflected in some of the responses to open ended questions included in the survey, such as:

- Library phased out in 04
- Pending transfer to the University
- Library is no longer in use
- Library is not totally functional since fire of 2002
- We are more of an archival system in which callers can request certain information.
- We lost our library about ten years ago when new employees who were hired by our Division needed the space.
- While we like to say we have a library, in reality, we do not.

This lack of attention to libraries and the services they provide affected the responses to this survey and presented some difficulties in analyzing them. The author of this paper has considerable personal knowledge regarding individual state DOT libraries. It should be noted that, due to the ambiguities presented by conflicting or partial responses, this knowledge
was often applied in analyzing the data. However, not all ambiguities could be resolved, so all results reported in this paper should be seen as somewhat approximate.

**RESPONSES**

The survey was conducted using a web based survey service and elicited a total of 66 full or partial responses. A copy of the questions included in the survey is attached to this paper. At least one response was provided from each of the fifty states. A total of twelve states had more than one respondent. The largest number of respondents from a single state was five.

Forty four states had at least one respondent who claimed to be reporting for a library serving the DOT in that state. Additionally, there were eight states with at least one respondent stating there was no library serving the DOT in question. There were two states for which one respondent stated the DOT in that state had a library, while another respondent stated it did not. Among the eight responses stating the DOT in question was not served by a library, all but one also stated the DOT in question maintained a collection of reports and other resources. Thus, all but one of the state DOTs has at least one function referred to as a library or maintains a collection of information resources for use of at least a portion of its employees.

Among the fifty eight responses from the forty four states where at least one respondent claimed the DOT in question has a library, thirty four claimed to be reporting on the only library serving that DOT. Five states among these thirty four produced responses from two libraries within the state for which at least one of the two stated it was reporting on the only library serving that DOT. In only one of these did both respondents claim to be reporting on the only one.

**SERVICES**

One of the more critical elements in planning future information services is the reach of existing services. Therefore, one of the most important questions in this survey sought information on the groups served by existing libraries. Table 1 provides the number of respondents selecting each choice provided in the survey relating to groups served by, and subject coverage of, existing libraries.

**Table 1: Service Reach of Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This library serves:</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOT and local practitioners</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT on all subjects</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOT on selected subjects</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single DOT district</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single DOT office</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Providing comprehensive access to transportation-related information is the ultimate goal of developing library networks, therefore, the responses of most interest are those from libraries serving both DOT staff and local practitioners and those covering all subjects. When multiple responses from a single state are accounted for, exactly one half of the states provided responses indicating the state has a library serving all DOT staff that covers all subjects and/or provides services to local practitioners.

The survey also attempted to determine how many of the libraries provided basic services to their customers and asked for actual or estimated measures of the services. The responses show a large proportion of the libraries reported on do not provide, or at least could not provide data for even the most basic services. From the numbers provided, it is evident that many that do provide basic services do so on a very limited basis.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services Provided</th>
<th>No. of Libraries</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Average or Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loans to DOT staff</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25 - 1,850/yr</td>
<td>408/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers to quick look-up or factual questions (phone numbers addresses statistical data)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3 - 15,000/yr</td>
<td>1,428/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answers to complex reference questions</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2 - 2,500/yr</td>
<td>271/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photocopies, reports downloaded, and referrals to web pages</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3 - 2,000/yr</td>
<td>245/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans from other libraries</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 - 1,000/yr</td>
<td>154/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to other libraries</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1 - 500/yr</td>
<td>98/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent acquisitions list</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Frequency; 5/day - biannually: Distributed to; Intranet - 20,000</td>
<td>Frequency; monthly [mode] Distributed to 740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searches for bibliographic citations relating to specified topics</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3 - 1,000/yr</td>
<td>119/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans to other than DOT staff</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5 - 500/yr</td>
<td>123/yr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routing of Current Periodicals</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Titles; 1 - 1,000+: Distributed to; 4 - 1,750</td>
<td>64 titles routed to 200 routees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although only 38 respondents provided estimated data on numbers of loans to DOT staff, as the following chart shows, a considerably larger number lend materials to DOT staff as well as other customer groups.
According to respondents, most of the libraries covered by this survey will lend to a broad group of customers. Another factor, beyond lending policies, that affects access to information is user charges. However, as can be seen in the next chart, very few of the libraries impose any fees. The few that do charge either $10.00 or $15.00 per item loaned or copied.

**COLLECTIONS**

The two measures most often used to compare library collection size are the number of monographs held, and the number of active periodical or serial subscriptions. The following charts show these two measures as reported by respondents to the survey.
These numbers should be taken with a grain of salt. The libraries covered by this survey have no standard definitions regarding what constitutes a monograph or serial nor for methods of counting them. For instance in the library managed by the author of this report, the number of monographs in the collection could be reported as either 17,500 or 27,000, the first number being a count of titles, the second, a count that includes multiple copies of a single title.

A more reliable comparison of monograph collection size is available for those libraries participating in OCLC. OCLC is the Online Center for Library Computing, a cooperative catalog system begun in 1968 that has become the international standard for cataloging library collections. There are currently more than 9,000 libraries in nearly 100 countries actively contributing catalog records to the database. The OCLC database contains nearly 1 billion records providing descriptions and location information for about 56 million information resources in participating libraries. OCLC also provides the base for the recently developed Transportation Libraries Catalog that provides a combined catalog of 340,000 items held by 20 transportation libraries in the U.S., including 15 libraries serving state DOTs.

In planning for the development of TL Cat, early in 2003 the author used OCLC to determine the number of cataloged monographs held by each of the seventeen DOT libraries then participating in the system. Cataloged holdings ranged between 1,400 and 19,600 items, averaging about 10,000.

The number of serials reported by the individual respondents is particularly suspect. It is highly unlikely that any library in this study currently subscribes to more than 400 titles. The higher numbers are most likely due to respondents counting individual issues of the serials held by a library. That said, it is evident that all the libraries serving state DOTs have rather modest collections, with the majority holding fewer than 20,000 monographs and 200 serials.
The survey also investigated what additional information resource formats are collected by state DOT libraries. Table 3 shows that in addition to monographs and serials most DOT libraries provide access to AV resources and a considerable number provide other formats, as well.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formats</th>
<th>No. of Libraries</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monographs</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25 - 68,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serials</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2 - 8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio Visual</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>5 - 2,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microfilm</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot;A few&quot; - 30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD-ROMs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23 - 300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also 16mm films, photos, pamphlets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acquisitions budgets are another common measure used to compare libraries and give an indication of a library's ability to acquire resources to keep its collections up-to-date. It also is an indication of a library’s ability to meet customer needs for materials not currently held in-house. The following chart shows the number of libraries selecting each of the categories provided in the survey for the library's annual materials and services budget.

Two-thirds of the libraries reported on by respondents have budgets of $15,000 or less. The inadequacy of these budgets can be realized by looking at the cost of some of the annual fees for serials and the price of some monographs held in the library managed by the author:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscription</th>
<th>Annual Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASCE journals subscription - Print and Internet Access</td>
<td>$10,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Research, Parts A-F</td>
<td>$6,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science and Technology</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Contents, Engineering Computing and Technology</td>
<td>$1,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway and Vehicle Safety Report</td>
<td>$555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Monograph

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Concrete Institute Manual of Concrete Practice</td>
<td>$710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AASHTO Load &amp; Resistance Factor Design (LRFD) Bridge Design Specifications, 3rd Edition</td>
<td>$270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Specifications for Highway Bridges, 17th Edition</td>
<td>$256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITE Trip Generation, 7th edition</td>
<td>$225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BEYOND COLLECTIONS**

Among the most basic of library services is providing a catalog so that customers and staff can efficiently identify and locate materials within the library. Since this survey was interested in the potential for remote searching of a library’s catalog to support interlibrary cooperation, it focused on electronic catalogs and the systems used to access them. As the following chart shows, nearly one-third of the libraries serving state DOTs do not provide any electronic access to information about their collections.

![Bar chart showing catalog systems](chart.png)

The chart below shows that in addition to the sixteen libraries that are not accessible electronically, an additional eight are accessible only by customers within their department's Intranet. The "WorldCat" referred to in the chart is the name for the search interface to the OCLC database. Although twenty three of the libraries report their materials are cataloged using OCLC, only eighteen report that their catalog is accessible via WorldCat. The most common reason for this discrepancy is a result of the materials in a DOT library being cataloged by a state or university library. When this is done, the DOT materials often can not be separately identified during a search using WorldCat.
Of course, library collections are just one of the tools required to provide library and information services. It is virtually impossible to meet the information needs of transportation practitioners without the ability to identify and provide access to resources beyond those held by the library. The identification portion of this task, or bibliographic searching, requires access to databases such as TRIS, Compendex, NTIS, and others. As Table 2 showed, only thirty one of the fifty eight libraries provide bibliographic search services. The table below shows the number of libraries that reported using various databases to provide bibliographic services.

### Table 4: Databases Used for Searching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Number of Libraries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRIS Online</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Transportation Library</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Technical Information Service</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compendex</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIS via Dialog</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPORT CD</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others (Ingenta, STN, Easy, Lexis-Nexis, PubMed, Biosis)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Once relevant information resources have been identified, the next, often more difficult task, is acquiring the full-text of those items for use by transportation practitioners. There are many ways of accessing and acquiring information resources. The following chart shows how many libraries serving state DOTs use each of a number of methods for acquiring resources to meet specific needs.
Resource sharing networks are the tool librarians have created to extend their reach into larger collections and into collections of resources outside the subjects covered by their in-house collections. As the next chart shows, just over half of the libraries covered by this survey participate in such networks; however, most participate in just a single network.

Beyond these quantitative measures of library services are indicators of the quality of services provided by libraries serving state DOTs. Services are, by their nature, labor-intensive activities. Therefore, the size and background of staff assigned to the library function is a preliminary indicator of the quality of services provided. Of course, a better indication would be provided by outcome measures for each of the libraries and their services. Unfortunately, given the current lack of standards for such measures and relatively immature state of development of most DOT libraries, there is currently no way to collect comparative outcome data.
These numbers demonstrate the reason for the lack of basic services provided by many of the libraries noted earlier in this paper. The majority has 1 FTE or less staff assigned to the function. When this staffing level is combined with the budget figures shown above, it is evident the average total budget for libraries serving DOTs is somewhere in the neighborhood of $100,000 per year. The inadequacy of these budgets can be seen by comparing them with figures reported in "The Changing Roles of Content Deployment Functions: Corporate Information Professionals," by Outsell, Inc., dated June 6, 2003. That paper reported on a survey of corporate libraries and showed that annual corporate library budgets averaged $844 per active library customer and $173 per potential customer. The paper also reported that the average library staff to active customer ratio was 1:208. Although this survey provided no directly comparable measure, it is obvious, given the size of DOT staffs, the customer side of this ratio would be considerably larger for libraries in this survey.

In addition to staff size, the status of the library staff is an indicator of its ability to provide an adequate range and quality of services as well as an indicator of the level of organizational support for the operation. There are several ways of looking at the status of the person in charge of libraries serving DOTs that were covered by this survey, as shown in the following charts.
The last of these charts is the most telling. Ninety percent of the libraries serving state DOTs have 1 FTE or less professional staff. The relationship between measures of professional staff and other indicators of a library’s ability to meet customer needs is shown in the following charts.
Those libraries that are managed by individuals with an MLS, considered the minimum educational requirement in the profession, have more nearly adequate budgets. These libraries also participate to a much larger extent in OCLC, a system that facilitates interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing. With the advent of TL Cat, OCLC also provides services directly accessible by transportation practitioners. And, libraries managed by individuals with an MLS, on average, use a wider variety of methods for fulfilling customer needs.

Another indicator of organizational support for DOT libraries and their staff that was of interest to those planning library networks is employer reimbursement for travel. Development of library cooperative and collaborative networks requires periodic meetings to establish and refine resource sharing agreements and to discuss other issues involved in maintaining a library network. Employer support for travel is essential in this effort. The chart below shows that less than one-half of library staff even at the professional level, receive this level of employer support.
One last item of interest was employer reimbursement for membership in professional associations. Over the last several decades, the Transportation Division of the Special Libraries Association has been the focal point for efforts to improve cooperation between transportation libraries through its Government Transportation Research Information Committee. Members of the Division have been instrumental in the development of TRIS from its beginnings. They have also initiated the proposals for NCHRP projects that have developed the Transportation Research Thesaurus and studied the means to, and benefits of, improved U.S. access to non-English language transportation information resources. In spite of the benefits of participating in this group, only eleven states reimbursed membership fees for the person in charge of their library.

The last two questions on this survey were open ended questions seeking the opinion of respondents:

- In your opinion what are the biggest gaps in the current transportation information system?
- What changes in the transportation information system do you think would yield the biggest payoff?

The full responses to each of these questions are attached to this report. Although the questions are worded differently, they elicited similar responses. Comments revolve around the need for improved access to transportation information resources, especially in electronic formats; the lack of funding and staffing needed to provide transportation-related information services, and the need for national leadership and coordination to address these problems.

CONCLUSION

This survey attempted to gather information of use in planning the future development of library and information services serving the transportation community in the U.S. It focused on the services, collections, staffing and support of existing libraries serving state departments of transportation. Although virtually all state DOTs are served by something called a library, or at least have a collection of information resources, most of these facilities lack sufficient staff and resources to provide even minimal levels of services and access to information resources not included in the DOT’s in-house collections.

In the opinion of the author of this paper, the following elements are required to provide even the most basic level of information services to an organization the size of a state department of transportation.

- Facility managed by an individual with an MLS or equivalent education and experience
- At least 1 FTE professional and 1 FTE support staff
- Budget of at least $30,000 for materials and services
Participate in OCLC

When the fifty-eight facilities for which responses were provided are compared on just these measures, only five state DOTs are served by at least one library or information center that meet all of the criteria. Obviously there is a great deal of development that needs to be done at the state level in order to provide local service nodes required to share resources on a regional or national basis.

Responses to final two, open-ended questions

In your opinion what are the biggest gaps in the current transportation information system?

- We're just beginning our software program so we aren't able to answer this question.
- We have no on-line access nor do we have staff to update information. It would be an asset to be able to know where material is available in other units. We probably spend a good deal of time duplicating efforts. We are also physically limited in available space and can not maintain archival documents.
- We can't afford to do everything so we just do what we can.
- Transportation gaps occur when all DOT state's catalog are not accessible on the web and lack of communication between the states.
- The relatively small number of transportation related organizations that have in house libraries and the very limited staffing and funding provided to the few that do exist.
- Reports are announced before they are published and then they are not available for several months.
- No central repository or head without a functioning National Transportation Library. Not everything is indexed/cataloged. LC subject headings don't collocate material on shelf in a great way so browsing more difficult.
- My opinion is that everything should be accessible via the internet.
- Management's lack of recognition of the value of libraries in providing transportation information to their patrons and the lack of financial & personnel support.
- Locating electronic documents and having continued access. Some documents (government private etc.) never get indexed.
- Library documents should be consolidated in one location. Need more on-line services to better serve customers.
- Lack of coordination and resource sharing.
- Lack of budget for new materials in the state DOR libraries.
- Lack of appreciation for the value of the services provided by the information professional. Lack of strong advocates in leadership positions.
- It would be great to see employees more interested in life long learning inside AND OUTSIDE of their technical area.
- International information.
- I would say the volatility of web publishing sometimes at the expense of print versions leads to information not getting into traditional transportation information channels. For example a transportation organization may publish only electronically post on their web site and leave it at that without disseminating archival print copies for libraries or sending the URL to nationwide transportation information databases like TRIS.
- I use TRIS online the most when looking for information. I feel that it takes me much longer to find anything I need then it did when I first started using it. It is not as user friendly as before.
- I think we need to beef up our archival system. We are currently working on that.
- I think Ohio's transportation information system is pretty strong thanks to networks like OCLC OhioLINK & MTKN.
- I don't know if it is the biggest gap but is one of the first things that needs to be addressed. We need to get all transportation libraries on OCLC. This is going to require marketing group buying and support.
Then or perhaps simultaneously we need to form a national network. We also need to make sure the NTL is alive and well for many years to come.

- Greater formal collaboration. Better leadership for national initiatives. More willingness on behalf of participants to compromise.
- For me a lot of the information exchange that I see has a grassroots feel to it. For example on TRANLIB librarians talk to one another and then take some of those discussions to interested parties in our own organizations. But it seems like the discourse occurs mainly on one plane. The important matters need to be directed up not only across so that those in positions of power in the transportation community those who make decisions and can influence (or direct) other people will become aware of the need for more widespread dissemination of information and research.
- Electronic preservation and access of non-print materials
- Centralized archival preservation of electronic transportation reports.
- Access to European transportation materials.

What changes in the transportation information system do you think would yield the biggest payoff?

- TLCat is a great step in the right direction. Wish it could be all-inclusive. I don't see any hope for my library because of costs and other roadblocks - others are probably in the same boat. A GrayLit source such as DOE's would be useful.
- Over the long run - consistent and ongoing support of transportation information resources and at the Federal level.
- One possibility would be to occasionally send out a brief synopsis (e-mail) about something new/revolutionary/significant happening in the transportation world with a link to either a web site or other information source in the Mn/DOT library.
- National network of transportation libraries that develop free or reduced-fee resource sharing and document delivery; build collaborative collections nationwide; develop consortiums to better negotiate with vendors; share expertise; and create databases similar to TRIS Medline Agricola etc. Educate managers on importance and contribution of libraries that everything is not on the internet and that information isn't free.
- More on-line access to full-text documents. Our patrons always want materials asap - electronically if possible.
- Marketing the value of information and the value of an NTL. Obtaining support for NTL just like the NLM.
- Making everything available electronically.
- I would like to see more electronic documents that can be browsed for specific information needed. Needs to be more user friendly for searching.
- I don't know.
- I don't know but I do know that my position was created with federal money and making sure this position stays a permanent fixture is the biggest payoff for Nevada Department of Transportation.
- Having centralized or cooperative collection management.
- Having a scanner on site would save us a lot of time. Right now we have to rely on the ITD folks to scan material for us. We have little control of the timing of the distribution. It would also be helpful extremely helpful control the schedule if we could.
- Greater awareness of the research and work being done as well as of the information available and how it can be accessed. I see this as the ultimate goal: that anyone who needs transportation information will have a good idea where to find it and know whom to ask if they can't find it on their own.
- Funding the National Transportation Library & supporting the DOT Libraries.
- Expand the clearing house and TRIS.
- Establishment of transportation libraries in agencies that are presently without.
- Currently there are no resources for the library due to budget constraints.
• Create a federal mandate that every state will have a library staffed by professionals and adequately funded in order to receive and ensure that research funding is properly spent.
• Coordinated efforts toward creating secure electronic archives with standards for formatting migration and backup.
• Continued support and development of transportation information networks like MTKN as well as digital and full-text database collections.
• Continue to promote DOT libraries as important.
• Biggest payoff would be more communication between states and placing each state's DOT library catalog on the web. The (GDOT) library's catalog will be available on the web soon.
• Basically drivers want to know if there are any delays on their commutes. That is how this department best serves the community.
• Access availability to all interested parties via the internet rather than be limited to the intranet
• A well-funded and staffed National Transportation Library with cooperative collection development and archiving across the transportation library community. More staff devoted to capturing transportation information both in print and online and processing it for retrieval (i.e. indexing and/or cataloging). Updated subject headings perhaps using terms from TRT.
• A recognition by executives in the field of transportation that providing for the preservation and management of publications and information resources produced by transportation-related organizations and ensuring efficient access to those materials for both current and future transportation practitioners is among their responsibilities and one to which they must commit a portion of the resources under their control.

Survey Questions

1. Is the library or collection for which you are completing this survey the only one in your state DOT?
   Yes
   No

2. What group of customers is the library or collection for which you are completing this survey intended to serve?
   A single office within this DOT
   A single district within this DOT
   The entire Department of Transportation on selected subjects (aviation, pavements, research, etc.)
   The entire Department of Transportation on all subjects
   The Department of Transportation and local transportation practitioners for the entire state
   Other (please specify)

3. What is the status of the individual in charge of the library or collection?
   Librarian
   Para-professional
   Clerical
   Other (please specify status)

4. What is the highest educational level achieved by the person in charge of the library or collection?
   High school
   Some college
   Bachelors degree (Please indicate major in "Other" box, below)
   Masters in Library Science
   Other (please specify)

5. Please indicate staffing levels, in terms of Full Time Equivalents (FTEs), assigned to organize the collection and assist customers accessing the collection.
   Librarian(s) with professional credentials
   Para-professional library assistant(s)
   Clerical and administrative staff
6. What is the approximate count of items in your collection in the following formats?

Monographs (books, technical reports, and conference proceedings)
Serials (active journal titles)
Microfilm or microfiche
Audiovisual
Other Resources (Please specify format and quantity)

7. What is your current annual expenditure for materials and services (excluding salaries) for this library or collection?

- Less than $5,000
- $5,001-15,000
- $15,001-30,000
- $30,001-45,000
- $45,001-60,000
- More than $60,000

8. Do you participate in OCLC or other system for cataloging your collection?

- Use OCLC
- Do not use any system
- Use other system (please specify system used)

9. How can customers search your collection? (Please check all that apply)

- OCLC WorldCat
- On-line catalog on our Intranet
- On-line catalog on the Internet
- Traditional card catalog
- On site browsing
- Other (please specify)

10. Who may borrow materials from your library? (Please check all that apply)

- Employees of this DOT
- Other state DOT libraries
- University libraries
- Employees of other state agencies
- Contractors and consultants employed by your DOT
- Local (city, county, MPO, etc.) employees
- Other (please specify)

11. Does this library or collection charge a fee for lending any resources?

- No
- Yes (please specify rate(s))

12. Does this library or collection participate in any formal or informal collaborations with others to help share resources (e.g., regional network, State Library, university libraries)?

- Yes
- No (please specify)

13. How does your library obtain loans or copies of materials not available in your collection? (Please check all that apply)

- Through OCLC
- Through local or regional network(s)
- Direct request to other libraries
- Direct purchase from vendor or publisher
Online, full-text services (Factiva, Dialog, etc.)
Download from the web
Other (please specify)

14. Which of the following services are provided by the staff assigned to your library or collection? (Please provide actual counts or best estimates)

- Recent acquisitions list (please provide frequency and distribution count)
- Routing of Current Periodicals (please provide counts of titles routed and number of routees)
- Loans to internal (DOT) customers (annual count)
- Loans to external (non-DOT) customers (annual count)
- Photocopies, downloaded reports and articles, referrals to web pages or other resources provided in response to customer requests other than loaned materials (annual count)
- Loans from other libraries (annual count)
- Loans to other libraries (annual count)
- Answers to quick look-up or factual questions (phone numbers, addresses, statistical data) (annual count)
- Answers to complex reference questions (annual count)
- Searches for bibliographic citations relating to specified topics (annual count)

15. If your staff performs searches for bibliographic citations, what resources are used? (Please check all that apply)

- TRIS Online
- TRIS via Dialog
- TRANSPORT CD
- Compendex
- WorldCat
- National Transportation Library
- National Technical Information Service
- Other (please specify)

16. Please indicate in what ways your organization provides support for staff assigned to the library or collection?

- Membership fees in professional organizations
- Special Libraries Association
- American Records Managers and Administrators
- American Society for Information Science and Technology
- State library association
- Other (please specify)

- Fees and travel to attend professional conferences
- In-state
- Out-of-state
- International
- Other (please specify)

17. In your opinion, what are the biggest gaps in the current transportation information system?

18. What changes in the transportation information system do you think would yield the biggest payoff?