

APPENDIX A: Charge: SOPAG TASK FORCE ON UC LIBRARIES COLLECTIONS SPACE PLANNING

Space to house UC's legacy and prospective print collections is becoming critical. Both campus space and the Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) are reaching capacity. Based on current allocations, SRLF Phase 2 is projected to be filled by the beginning of 2012. Phase 3 of the NRLF opened in Spring 2005 and will fill by mid-2015 based on current allocations. It is becoming clear that the State fiscal crisis will delay a timely opening of the SRLF Phase 3.

Given the imminent space dilemma created by the uncertainty of SRLF Phase 3, it is necessary to identify short-term options for print collections space. UC Libraries must also develop a new long-term plan to manage the shared collections space available across UC and with potential partner libraries outside UC.

The Collections Space Planning Task Force is charged to:

1. Identify opportunities and challenges within UC for better managing RLF space in coordination with campus space plans, both in the short and longer term.
2. Investigate what other academic libraries and national organizations are doing to address space issues. Identify opportunities for partnerships outside UC and options for developing collections regionally and nationally.
3. Provide recommendations on defining the nature of the RLF collections in the future. Take into consideration:
 - o The types of materials that should be given priority for RLF storage;
 - o How retrospective and prospective shared collections fit into RLF strategies, including the potential for decentralized shared collections that could be housed across campuses and/or RLFs;
 - o Potential of de-duplication across the RLFs, among collections on campuses, and, potentially, with non-UC partners;
 - o How mass digitization projects and digital preservation services relate to print storage needs;
 - o Integrity of collections in the event of natural disasters or other emergencies.
4. Recommend long-term options, actions, and policies for best managing RLF collection space in coordination with UC campus space plans, and that take into consideration how mass digitization projects and digital preservation services will impact print storage needs and physical storage facilities.
5. Provide analysis of costs and benefits of each recommendation.
6. From these recommendations, prioritize the top 5 options to actions to explore and/or actions to implement.

The Task Force should consult with CDC, HOPS, the Next-Generation Technical Services Steering Team, the CDL Shared Print Program, and the CDL Preservation Program in particular, and more broadly as needed.

Progress Report: September 1, 2009

Draft Final Report to SOPAG: November 2009 [extended to January 2009]

Final Report to University Librarians: December 2009

Recommended Task Force membership:

Lucia Snowhill (SB), Chair

Chuck Eckman (B)

Sharon Farb (LA)

Joanne Miller (CDL), staff

18 June 2009

APPENDIX B: Committees, Projects & Reports

From **SOPAG TASK FORCE ON UC LIBRARIES COLLECTIONS SPACE PLANNING** charge:

2. Investigate what other academic libraries and national organizations are doing to address space issues. Identify opportunities for partnerships outside UC and options for developing collections regionally and nationally.

UC-related committees/ACGs/task forces and documents

Committees/task forces

In Progress

- Next Gen Tech Services (Overlap with Collection Space Planning Task Force seen in potential future use of RLFs)
- UC Shared Print (<http://www.cdlib.org/services/collections/sharedprint/index.html>) coordinating
- UC Shared Print Steering Task Force (<http://www.cdlib.org/inside/groups/spstf/index.html>)
- CDC RLF Persistence Implementation Task Force, Charge February 26, 2009 [in progress]
To develop guidelines governing replacement and preservation treatment of items designated as persistent that have either been lost or damaged...to the point that they cannot be circulated.
- CDC Preservation Advisory Group (PAG) is currently reviewing the issue-level validation standards at CDC and UC Shared Print's request.
- UC Collection Development Committee. *The University of California Library Collection: Content for the 21st Century and Beyond*. Endorsed by University Librarians, July 2009

Proposed

- Common access for shared print monographs policy (Draft from Shared Print Steering Task Force to CDC-Sept 2009) [under discussion]
- Proposed Shared Print Monographs acquired collectively and located at an RLF or "in place" as part of designated Shared Print In Place collection (from the Shared Print Steering Task Force, August 2009). [under discussion]
- *Proposal for a Retrospective Shared Print Journal Service at the RLFs*. March 17, 2009 [under discussion. Includes cost analysis]
- Current Print Journal Subscription Coordination for UC Libraries in tandem with WEST: Use Cases for the Ulrich's Serials Analysis System and XML data feed (For CDC). [discussion for CDC, December 2009]
- Risk Assessment: Library Collections Tool
<http://www.ucop.edu/riskmgt/erm/libcollwb.html> *January 2010*

- Prospective monograph collecting--Shared approval plans—area studies and general/major mono vendor (currently investigating)

Previous

RLF Persistence Task Force (2006)

(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/RLF_Persistence/)

UC Southern Regional Library Facility De-duplication Efforts. Presentation prepared for the LLAMA Storage Discussion Group by Colleen Carlton, July 12, 2009.

Prospective Shared Print Monographs: A Decentralized Collection Model Initially focused on International and Area Studies. Report from the CDC/CDL Task Force on Prospective Shared Print Monographs to CDC (October, 2008)

(http://www.cdlib.org/inside/resources/sharedprint/documents/TaskForce_finalreport_103008.doc)

CDC Task Force on RLF De-duplication Report (December, 2006)

(http://www.cdlib.org/inside/resources/sharedprint/documents/De_Dup_Report.pdf)

Reducing Duplication and Enhancing Research Value at UC Regional Library Facilities: Recommendations. Report prepared by Nancy Kushigian, Office of Systemwide Library Planning, April 27, 2006.

Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force. Final Report to the University Librarians. Corrected version December 10, 2004.

Cost Analysis and Statistics

UC Shared Print. *Annual Statistics Prepared for University of California Library Statistics, 2008-2009.*

Prospective Shared Print for Licensed Content: UC Processing Cost Estimates per Unit and Publisher. October 31, 2009. Prepared by the Shared Print Program.

State of the RLFs. Projected Fill Rates. October 23, 2009. Prepared by Colleen Carlton, Scott Miller, Bernie Hurley and Susan Parker.

Taylor and Francis Shared Print Archive – Cost and RLF Space implications. [unpublished] Ivy Anderson, May 30, 2007

Regional & national committees/ACGs/task forces and documents

Libraries and national organizations are joining together to form regional partnerships. CRL maintains a list of print archives, both operational and in planning stages, by format archived. See link to PrintArchivesSummaryList.xls from <http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/print-archives/print-archive-initiatives-worldwide>

In-progress

- JSTOR (Retrospective dim repository of over XXX titles with page-level validation.)
- WEST: Toward a Western Regional Storage Trust. December 17, 2009. Proposal for a distributed retrospective print repository “service” for print journal backfiles. [in progress]
- RLG is currently working with several research libraries to enable a prospective print journal commitments at the network level for scarcely held journals in the Humanities. UCLA is participating.
- NYU/ReCAP Cloud Library Project with Hathi, Ithaka and OCLC. Exploring models to combine print holdings of a digital repository and those in offsite print facilities as surrogates for onsite print at libraries. Results expected January 2010
- MARC 583 for Print Archiving Project. Effort to use the MARC 583 field to record retention and preservation information to facilitate coordination of shared collections, provide visibility and encourage participation. MARC 21 Format for Bibliographic Data: 583 - Action Note (R)
<http://www.loc.gov/marc/bibliographic/bd583.html>
- CRL Cooperative Print Management three-year plan (2010-2012) to support development of cooperative print management networks.
- RLG Shared Print Council task group is creating a decision tree to assist libraries in determining when to de-accession print back-files of e-journals. Report expected the end of 2009.

Proposed

- UC-CRL Proposal for a Shared Print for Shared Print Archive of Licensed E-Journal Content (*Prospective*) <http://www.crl.edu/archiving-preservation/current-projects/shared-print-archive>
- LYRASIS has submitted an IMLS proposal for a six month planning project to begin developing framework and defining a national model for monograph archiving and storage. Other projects have concentrated on journals, government documents, newspapers.
- Ithaka has held discussion with federal depository libraries proposing creation of shared legacy collections in coordination with digitization.

Previous

- North American Storage Trust (NAST) and Cooperative Collection Management Trust (CCMT) Pilot [These are past OCLC Programs. See: <http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/past/workagenda/collectivecoll/sharedprint/nast.htm>]

Papers/Documents/Projects—National

Documents for a Digital Democracy: A Model for the Federal Depository Library Program in the 21st Century: Interim Summary Ithaka S&R, October 2009. (Available from <http://www.arl.org/bm~doc/summary-fdlp-10-15-09.pdf>)

Kairis, Rob. "Consortium level collection development: a duplication study of the OhioLINK Central Catalog", *Library Collections, Acquisitions, & Technical Services*, 27 (2003) 317-236.

Milchalko, Jim and Constance Malpas. "Managing the Collective Collection" *NextSpace: The OCLC Newsletter*, no. 12, June 2009 (<http://www.oclc.org/US/EN/nextspace/012/research.htm>)

OCLC Research in Shared Print. *Define Policy and Infrastructure Requirements for Building and Managing Shared Print Collection* (<http://www.oclc.org/research/activities/policy/default.htm>) [Includes: Cloud Libraries, MARC 583 field, and risk assessment for print journals]

RLG Partnership Shared Print Collection Working Group. *Shared Print Policy Review Report*, January 2009 (<http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2009/2009-03.pdf>)

Payne, Lizanne. *Library Storage Facilities and the Future of Print Collections in North America*. 2007 (<http://www.oclc.org/research/publications/library/2007/2007-01.pdf>)

Schonfeld, Roger & Ross Housewright. *What to withdraw? Print collections management in the wake of digitization*. Sept. 29, 2009 (Ithaka S&R) (Available from <http://www.ithaka.org/ithaka-s-r/research/what-to-withdraw/>) Includes a decision tool to help determine when withdrawal is acceptable.

Yano, Candace et al. *Optimizing the number of copies for print preservation of research journals*. October 2008.

APPENDIX C: Overview of the UC Regional Library Facilities: operations, programs, and policies

RLFs are governed system-wide by a single Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB) (<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/slfb/>)

Policies regarding campus deposits and efficient collection management (all documents are linked from the SLFB website) are:

- “Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities,” May 6, 2004
- “Procedures for Annual Management of Deposits to the UC Regional Library Facilities,” November 8, 2006
- “Regional Library Facilities Statement of Operating Principles,” November 27, 2006
- “Criteria for Evaluating Requests for Non-UC Deposits to UC Shared Library Facilities,” June 19, 2008

Roles of regional facilities are:

- Storage of less frequently needed materials in all formats
- Preservation imaging at SRLF (microfilm images, microfilm reels, digital images)
- Depository for single system-wide print copy of journals received only electronically by campuses.
- Facility for housing designated shared print collections (the Shared Print Program, with 60,000 volume equivalents in the RLFs, still at the beginning of its potential).

Shared library facilities, such as the RLFs, are foundational components of the University's ongoing strategy to avoid unnecessary costs and improve library service by leveraging resources and operations on a system-wide basis. Note that construction costs per volume for RLFs are approximately ¼ those for campus facilities (\$10.31 per volume, vs. \$44.73).

When the RLFs were first conceived their role consisted primarily of providing storage for items deposited by the campus libraries in each region, providing the services required to process and control the deposited material, and to retrieve and deliver items to the requesting library as needed. While the range of services offered by the RLFs has expanded over the last 25 years, the basic role has remained unchanged.

In 2007-08, about 140,000 items were borrowed or photocopied from the RLF collections. This significant annual level of use is more than twice as much as the 61,000 items borrowed by the UC libraries from all other libraries nationwide on interlibrary loan during the same period.

**State of the RLFs
October 23, 2009**

Prepared by Colleen Carlton, Scott Miller, Bernie Hurley and Susan Parker

Budget Summary

2009/10 Budget Projections : 19900 Funds

SRLF		NRLF	
Appropriations/Carryforward		Appropriations/Carryforward	
Staff Salaries	\$ 898,999	Staff Salaries	\$ 902,505
Staff Salaries Cut	--	Staff Salaries Cut (FY10 portion – perm)	\$ (103,455)
Staff Salaries Furloughs/Temp layoffs	\$ (40,353)	Staff Salaries Furloughs/Temp layoffs	\$ (35,924)
General Assistance	\$ 2,342	General Assistance	--
Supplies & Expenses	\$ 191,480	Supplies & Expenses	\$ 55,414
Supplies & Expenses (5% Cut)	\$ (8,625)	Supplies & Expenses Cut	--
Equipment & Facilities	\$ 22,386	Equipment & Facilities	--
Carryforward (Non-recurring)	\$ 35,785	Carryforward (Non-recurring)	\$ 187,045
Carryforward Cut	--	Carryforward Cut (FY10 – temporary)	\$ (68,970)
Total	\$ 1,102,014	Total	\$ 936,615
 Projected Expenses		 Projected Expenses	
Staff Salaries	\$ 695,591	Staff Salaries	\$ 790,453
Staff Salaries Furloughs/Temp layoffs	\$ (40,353)	Staff Salaries Furloughs/Temp layoffs	\$ (35,924)
General Assistance	\$ 100,000	General Assistance	\$ 75,000
Supplies & Expenses	\$ 243,095	Supplies & Expenses	\$ 125,000
Equipment & Facilities	\$ 62,386	Equipment & Facilities	--
Total	\$ 1,060,719	Total	\$ 954,529
 Operating Balance	 \$ 41,295	 Operating Balance	 \$ (17,914)
 UCLA Library Appropriations			
Staff Salaries	\$ 119,046		
Supplies & Expenses	\$ 1,182		
Unfunded Benefits Costs funded by UCLA Library	\$ 17,438		
SRLF Portion of Total UCLA Library 5% budget cut funded by UCLA Library	\$ 46,475		
Total	\$ 184,141		

The RLF budget projections include salary reductions for furloughs, temporary layoffs, and other reductions that will be applied this fiscal year. The salary reductions will also impact FY1011 RLF budgets as furloughs for policy-covered staff will continue through August 2010, and layoffs/time reductions for staff covered by collective bargaining agreements will continue into the next fiscal year.

SRLF: The SRLF appropriation for career salaries includes an increase this year of \$66,174 for the temporary transfer of 2 FTE from the UCLA Library. Two career staff have been reassigned to assist in SRLF Processing through December 2010. These assignments follow a previous transfer of 1 FTE from UCLA Library to the SRLF in April 2009, and will help the SRLF to keep pace with existing deposit allocations. The transfers are effective October and November, 2009.

The SRLF has a number of open career positions. The open provisions remain with SRLF and salary savings from these positions have been retained within the SRLF. It is only with these salary savings that the SRLF is able to cover Sub 2, 3 and 4 expenses such as GA, salary increases from bargaining or reclassifications, supplies, and equipment replacements/upgrades.

In 2009/10 Sub 3 expenses will increase with revised rates charged by UCLA Library for Voyager/Library Information support. Annual costs to the SRLF for Voyager access and storage will increase from \$83,000 to \$143,140. In 2009/10 the SRLF will be able to cover the Voyager increase of ca. \$60,000 with carry forward funds from last fiscal year, but it will be extremely difficult to cover these costs in 2010/11 and beyond without a permanent increase to the Sub 3 appropriation.

The RLFs will also be facing increased costs for employer-paid benefits when health insurance costs are adjusted in January 2010, and when retirement contributions resume in April 2010. Whether or not these costs will be covered centrally at UCB and UCLA campuses remain to be determined.

NRLF: Going into FY 09/10, NRLF's permanent 19900 allocation was \$957,919 (83% for career staff salaries and 17% for general assistance and supplies & expenses). The FY 09/10 permanent budget cut is 18% (\$172,425), of which 60% (\$103,455) is to be taken in 09/10 and 40% (\$68,970) in 10/11. The FY 09/10 temporary (one-time) budget cut is \$68,970. Not including non-recurring carryforward funds and subtracting salary reductions due to furloughs, NRLF has \$818,540 of 19900 funds for FY 09/10. [Note: This does not include the annual temporary allocations from CDL to support the Google Mass Digitization Project.]

Because there have been no recent staff vacancies, NRLF has been unable to reduce salary spending to meet the diminished budget. General Assistance costs are being reduced 25%, and we're making efforts to reduce S&E spending (now about \$125K/yr). The largest part of our S&E budget is the administrative/automation support fee paid to the UCB Library - \$75K/yr currently, but UCB is considering a rate change. Total expenses in FY 09/10 are projected to be \$954,529.

We have enough one-time money to get through this year without a reduction in services. Next year we will take the remaining 40% of the FY 09/10 permanent budget cut and will have to reduce staff. We assume that the SLF Board will want to maintain access services to the collections (e.g., quick delivery of requested items; electronic document delivery of requested articles), so the spending cuts will have to come from deposit services. (If the Board feels differently, we'd like to know as soon as possible.) The necessary staff reductions - up to 5 FTE

- would reduce our deposit processing capacity by more than 60% (from 221,500 ve/year to about 83,000 ve/year).

Processing Capacity for New Deposits in 2009/10

SRLF: In 2008/09, the SRLF added 243,363 items, including 16,000 extra deposits from UCSD and ca. 41,000 items for the UC Shared Print collections. Unfortunately the SRLF is projecting a lower processing capacity in 2009/10 due to fewer staff resources and the impacts of furloughs and layoff/time reductions. The transfer of staff from UCLA Library to the SRLF will bring significant help later in the year after the staff has been trained, but will not fully meet the demand of the campus deposit allocations. Even with the staff transfers, the 2009/10 projection for processing capacity is 216,500 items. The shortfall this year between base allocations (200,000 items; 220,000 ve) and Shared Print (36,500 items) verses processing capacity is 20,000 items. In light of this shortfall, the RLF Board may need to review campus allocations and temporarily lower the numbers for 2009/10. Because of the projected processing shortfall, extra deposits from UCLA and UCSD have not yet been scheduled in 2009/10.

NRLF: The availability of one-time money and the absence of staff vacancies would allow NRLF to process the campuses' full deposit allocations this year (221,500 ve; normally about 200,000 items). However, mandatory furloughs will reduce production time by about 3%. This is expected to have some effect on the amount of material we can process, perhaps reducing our output by as many as 6,000 items. Of greater concern is the possibility that represented employees will be temporarily laid off to meet the salary reduction targets. If that were to occur, NRLF could lose another 4-5% of production time, reducing deposit processing output by an additional 8,000 - 10,000 items.

Projected Fill Rates (NRLF Phase 3; SRLF Phase 2)

SRLF: As of October 1, 2009, SRLF had 646,583 volume equivalents of space remaining to be filled. This table identifies the fill rates by format, and the projected fill dates are based on current deposit patterns from the southern campuses and Shared Print programs.

Format	Remaining Capacity (in items)	Remaining Capacity (volume equivalents)	Projected Fill Date
Volumes	280,288	280,288	November 2011
Rare Books (includes Shared Print)	168,080	168,080	August 2013
Manuscripts/Archives	15,332	59,028	April 2012
Maps & Drawings	500	960	June 2010
Microfilm	7,056	1,905	April 2010
Microfiche	1,936 (linear feet)	12,627	October 2016
Film & Video	64,425	123,695	October 2011
	537,617	646,583	

NRLF: As of October 1, 2009, NRLF had 1,378,500 volume equivalents of space remaining to be filled. Approximately 100,000 ve of that space is in microform cabinets, map cases, and on specialized shelving. If the northern campuses continue to deposit at their current allocation rates (221,500 ve/year total), the remaining space at NRLF will be filled by November 2015. However, it's likely that our standard shelving (for books, archival materials, etc.) will be filled several months earlier.

Public Services and Resource Sharing Workloads

SRLF: Requests from the UC campuses and from non-UC libraries have continued to increase in the last several years, with non-UC ILL requests having the biggest impact at the SRLF. In 2008/09, total paging requests increased by 8% and the subset of non-UC ILL requests jumped 35% over the previous year. To help explain the increases we look back to 2007/08 when, in anticipation of reclamation projects for NGM, the SRLF symbol was added to 1.2 million monograph titles in OCLC. Shortly thereafter non-UC libraries began submitting ILL requests to SRLF. These requests are filled directly at the SRLF. During the NGM Reclamation Project in Spring 2009, the SRLF symbol was set in OCLC records for serials and monograph titles, with SRLF holdings now appearing on 2.67 million records. SRLF is watching to see what impact this will have on ILL requests. In order to maintain SRLF's commitment for 24-hour turnaround on UC requests and 48-hour turnaround on non-UC requests, additional staff support has been assigned to public services and ILL. In 2008 an ILL/Preservation assistant was hired and the GA budget was increased in 2008/09 to assist with paging requests, desktop document delivery, and non-UC ILL workloads. In addition, processing staff are assigned up to 2 hours per day to help with daily paging requests and service at the SRLF Front Desk. In 2009/10, the increased GA budget will be sustained to support the UC requests and ILL workloads.

NRLF: The number of requests received from UC libraries and patrons held very steady from 2004/05 to 2007/08, but dropped 8% during 2008/09. Now that the NRLF symbol has been added to 2.1 million titles in OCLC, we will begin servicing non-UC libraries directly (rather than through the northern campus ILL units as in the past). We anticipate that our request workload will increase as dramatically as was the case at SRLF.

Impact of UC Shared Print Collections

SRLF: Since 2004, SRLF has processed 148,800 items into the UC Shared Print collection (unbound journal issues for licensed content and the Canadiana monographs). In addition, the JSTOR Print Archive contains 40,196 volumes contributed by the UC library collections as of June 30, 2009. Funding for SRLF expenses related to receiving, processing, and shelving these collections is provided by CDL, with distinct account and fund numbers for Shared Print and JSTOR projects. SRLF provides 1.5 FTE career staff to process the annual shared print collections, with salaries, benefits and supplies paid for on the CDL funds and on JSTOR contract funds. Paging requests for shared print materials continue to be very low, and staff costs for filling those requests are absorbed into the SRLF public services budget. In 2008/09, the SRLF filled 22 requests for UC Shared Print holdings, with most requests filled by document delivery.

NRLF: NRLF has processed 1,900 volumes into the IEEE UC Shared Print collection since March 2008. Since most of the contributed volumes have come from UCB and UCD as part of their regular deposit quotas, no additional resources for NRLF were thought to be necessary. But with staff reductions coming in FY 10/11, NRLF's ability to participate in the Shared Print program will be curtailed. We assume that any Shared Print projects that are to occur at NRLF will be accompanied by the additional resources deemed necessary and reasonable by the SLF Board.

Appendix D—UC Shared Print Program Overview, Notes from Emily Stambaugh, Sept.2009

CURRENT PROJECTS/PROGRAMS

Journals/Serials

- **Shared Print for Licensed Content (Prospective).** Approx 21,000 issues/items annually, 4,300 volume equivalents annually. This activity is expected to transition to CRL for the most part and sunset in the next 3-5 years as part of a broader transition to e-only. The FTE may be transitioned to WEST (Retrospective work) and GSA component of that transitioned to staff FTE.
- **JSTOR (retrospective).** Approx 10,000 issues/items/volume equivalents or 5 million pages annually. Contractual obligation through 2013. Highly skilled project management and operations team, highly valued community resource. Continuing project.
- **IEEE (retrospective).** Approx 240 volume equivalents in the first year, expected to grow as experience with issue-validation grows and UCB/NRLF systems infrastructure stabilizes. Continuing project.
- **CoreSTOR (retrospective).** 1,740 volume equivalents stored. Discontinued project. Continued storage required.
- **EEBO STC 1 and II. (prospective microform).** 20 volume equivalents annually.
- **Canadian Literature.** (prospective monographs). Discontinued project. Continued storage required.

NEAR TERM PROJECTS/PROGRAMS

Monographs

- **Shared Print Monographs acquired from a Primary Monograph Vendor.** We are considering a scenario that would ingest approx 40,000 volumes annually direct from vendor to RLF. Requires substitution of effort plus some extra activities to receive and verify shipments and communicate with the managing campus. RLF directors are currently preparing HR estimates. Alternately, the same number of volumes or some portion of them may be held as Shared Print in Place. Duplicates of those monographs are not eligible for RLF storage in the future. Requires a new practice at campuses and RLFS to check NGM for existence of a SP copy in the system before attempting to send a campus duplicate for storage.

Journals/Serials

- **WEST Restrospective Shared Print Journal Service (non JSTOR material).** 40-50,000 volumes annually, requires 2-3 FTE at each RLF, two cost recovery models proposed: substitution of effort, and extramural membership model. Includes a hybrid model of lower level validation, incorporating the best in project management approaches from JSTOR, with the issue-validation standards from IEEE, and a centralized model from efficiency analysis of JSTOR, IEEE and CoreSTOR.

NEW VISION FOR RLFs?

- From "RLFs as UC's attic" to "RLFs as distribution hub for collections and collection management services"
- Incorporate risk management principles into ongoing selection of materials for off-site shelving and balance this with capital planning for library renovations
- RLF as neutral ground for collection building, management and access services
- RLF3 at UC Merced -- lots of benefits, few drawbacks

- Technical Services in RLFs

SERVICES TO CONSIDER AT RLFs, including space needs for HR, staging materials and storage of materials

- Retrospective Journal Service (WEST) - see FTE figures and estimate volumes above
- Prospective Monograph receipt from Primary Monograph Vendor - see figures above
- Align a digitization service with ingest of Shared Print -- one-touch processing, especially for incoming retrospective print journal holdings (WEST), and maybe prospective monographs - to get snippets out there in Google?
- Digitization service for campuses
- Align and position robust access services at RLF -- e.g. enhance browsing capabilities, POD, digitization, ability for both to supply color and b&w digital copies
- Put a Technical Service unit - acquisitions, cataloging, digitization and IT - and campus independent ILS system in each RLF. This would create significant opportunities for shared resource management, collection development and new forms of discovery. Consider RLFs as the repository that rapidly services request from campuses. Consider the findings of recent user studies that indicate that one a user discovers an item isn't available locally, they aren't very interested in where an item is housed or supplied from, as long as it is supplied.

Human Resources and skills at RLFs

- Transition SP Personnel to RLF. Continue check-in for SP for licensed content, also process the backlog of SP work at RLF, train in project management and retrospective work. Requires some space for SP personnel and incoming materials.
- Substitution of Effort. Shared Print is currently writing proposals that recommend a substitution of effort method for funding HR. In many ways, this makes sense -- we would align current FTE at the RLFs to work on material that would normally come in from the campuses, just in a more organized way and applying some additional services/approaches. However, there will be a limit to how much effort can be "substituted" and how much will need to be paid for.
- Priorities and Backlogs. UC Libraries may consider writing some sort of policy into the operations manual to prioritize shared resources and processing backlogs of them over other resources. Certainly, the Shared Print in Place Policy will require some revisions to RLF operations. At a minimum, campuses and RLFs will need to check NGM for the existence of a SPIP copy before sending duplicate to the RLF.
- Project management and IT/Programming. SRLF has highly developed skills in these areas. Consider a training path and create opportunities for further development of these skills at NRLF.
- Business manager. As UCs engage in WEST, it is likely that contractual obligations will be set up that govern network level archives (archives that are serviced for. benefit and may be limited to a constituency beyond UC) This may require a business manager.
- Cataloging -- NRLF has highly developed skills in this area. Consider additional cataloging support and opportunities at both RLFs? Create OCLC authorizations at the RLFs not only for campus records but also for Shared Print records? The RLFs currently piggy back off of campus records to create a Shared Print record and then modify holdings. These records don't follow consistent standards across RLFs and are often not visible in NGM or even campus OPAC (thus limited access and seriously skewing usage data and any future analysis of the success of resource sharing.)

