

**University of California
Shared Library Facilities Board**

June 9, 2006, 11:30 a.m. – 3 p.m.
Kaiser Building, 7th Floor
300 Lakeside Drive, Room 712
Oakland CA

Meeting Notes

Members attending: Butter (Chair), Dunlap, Goldstein, Greenstein, Jackson, Leonard, Miller, Munoff, Prichard, Schottlaender, Sharrow, Strong, Steel
Staff: Carlton, Hurley, Kushigian, Lawrence, S. Miller
Guests: Ivy Anderson, Director of Licensed Content, CDL; Robin Chandler, Director of Built Content, CDL

1. Updating and combining Operating Principles (Discussion)

Background Materials:

- Regional Library Facilities Statement of Operating Principles, Annotated Draft (June 1, 2006)
- NRLF Operating Principles (<http://library.berkeley.edu/NRLF/operating.html>)
- SRLF Operating Principles (<http://www.srlf.ucla.edu/Deposit/OpPrinciples/OperatingPrinciples.htm>)

The Board agreed that the policy on non-duplication of deposits should continue to apply only to the destination RLF for the proposed deposit, and not on a systemwide basis at the present time (see Annotated Draft, Section 2.1, footnote 1). Implementing systemwide non-duplication would be premature in the absence of a fully articulated policy on planned duplication, as suggested by the recommendations of the RLF Task Force (Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force, Final Report to the University Librarians, December 10, 2004, available at http://www.slp.ucop.edu/documents/RLF-TF_Final_Report.pdf). The University Librarians have recently charged their Collection Development Committee to consider methods for managing prospective duplication of RLF deposits.

Action: The Board agreed to delete the provision in Section 2.1 prohibiting the deposit of realia.

Action: The Board agreed to restate the target period for delivery of requested material from RLFs in Section 3.1 as follows:

The target period for delivery of requested material to UC campuses is no more than two working days from ~~receipt of the request at the library location, as designated by the library,~~ receipt of the request at the RLF to availability receipt of the material at the requesting library.

Action: With respect to non-UC deposits, staff will revise the document where and as necessary to indicate that policies on deposit by non-UC depositors are under review. In the last paragraph of Section 1.2, staff will include in the discussion of shelving of non-UC deposits a reference to Section 1.4, where non-UC depositors are defined.

Other matters discussed included:

- Use of personal scanners by RLF reading room patrons (including both copyright compliance and effect on the condition of the materials)
- Service implications (for RLFs and campuses) of massively digitized collections as sources of fulfillment for what would have been RLF and ILL requests, including interpretation of RLF/ILL transaction statistics.

2. Persistence policy and implementation (Board Endorsement)

Background materials:

- Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities, Feb. 20, 2006
(http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/planning/RLF_Persistence_Policy_rev_final.pdf)

Action: Staff will (a) confirm start and end dates for the “nine-month window” and (b) revise the text in paragraph two of the “Background” section (and elsewhere as required) to appropriately reference the new Board and pending revised Operating Principles.

Action: The Board **endorsed** the adoption of the statement on Persistent Deposits in UC Regional Library Facilities, subject to the revisions described above (Moved: Schottlaender; seconded: Strong; endorsed unanimously)

3. RLF deposit planning

a. Interim Annual Allocation of Campus Deposits to RLFs (Board Endorsement)

Background:

- Interim Annual Campus Allocations for Elective Deposits to Regional Library Facilities (June 2, 2006)

Action: The Board **endorsed** the adoption of the proposed Interim Annual Allocation (Moved: Strong; seconded: Schottlaender; endorsed unanimously)

b. Procedure for Adjustments of Annual Allocations of Campus Deposits to RLFs (Board Endorsement)

Background:

- Procedures for Annual Management of Deposits to the UC Regional Library Facilities (Draft, June 2, 2006)

Butter introduced the item by noting an error in the agenda; this version of the document has not been reviewed by either the full Board or the University Librarians, and is therefore offered only for discussion at this time.

In response to a question, Lawrence reviewed the history of UC’s quantitative commitments to the State to deposit in the RLFs and the manner in which these commitments are employed in UC’s facilities planning and capital budgeting processes.

Action: University Librarians will discuss the draft procedure with their staffs, and provide comments **to Lawrence by August 1, 2006.**

In the interim, staff will consider the treatment of “exceptional deposits” in the text (the current definition in Section 2 confusingly combines the concepts of annual and total deposit allocations

on the one hand, and annual RLF processing capacity on the other) and undertake other minor editorial revisions as discussed.

c. Long-range deposit planning (Information)

Butter led a brief discussion of plans to examine long-range allocations of available RLF stack space, which are being pursued under the leadership of the University Librarians. A report should be available for the Board's consideration by fall 2006.

d. Requests for exceptional deposits (Action)

i. UCSC

ii. UCB

iii. UCR

Background material:

- UCSC Request for an Increase to their Deposit Allocation, October 6, 2004
- UCB Request for an Increase to their Deposit Allocation, October 6, 2004
- Email from Ruth Jackson to Karen Butter, May 24, 2006.

Action: The Board **approved** the requests from UCB and UCSC, subject to future Board actions on long-range deposit allocations and associated procedures (see items 3.b and 3.c above).

With respect to the UCR request, the Board discussed current policies regarding the deposit and management of preservation microfilms, and requested additional information about the proposal. Jackson will consult with her staff, Henry Snyder, and Gary Strong, and return to the Board with a revised proposal at a later date.

e. Requests from non-UC depositors

i. Graduate Theological Union (Action)

ii. California State Library via UCR (Action)

iii. (Added at the meeting) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

Background material:

- GTU Request to permanently store at NRLF 30,000 volumes as an initial deposit and 8,000 per year thereafter (undated document)
- (Distributed at the meeting): Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Library request to permanently deposit a the NRLF 70,000 items as an initial deposit and 2,500 items per year thereafter (Prepared June 8, 2006)

With regard to the California State Library request, Jackson has confirmed that (a) the CSL has custody of both the masters and reading copies of the films, and seeks to deposit the masters. See item 3.d above for next steps.

In general, the Board believes it inappropriate to take action on non-UC requests pending completion of its review of pertinent policies (see item 1 above). In passing, a Board member noted that the current policy on non-UC deposits, as represented in the *Operating Principles*, does not address the questions of acceptable duplication as between UC and non-UC deposits or within the non-UC deposit. The issue of persistent deposits was also raised for non-UC depositors.

With regard to the GTU proposal, Leonard described his thinking about a counter-proposal that GTU digitize the proposed deposits. Among the issues to be explored in this proposal are:

- Sources of scanning support (both operational and financial) and extent of UC involvement
- Extent of duplication with (a) UC holdings, (b) RLF deposits, and/or (c) UC material to be included in current or planned mass digitization projects
- Ownership of the print and/or digital versions, and mechanisms for transfer of title if necessary
- The intrinsic value of the original materials and GTU's willingness to discard after scanning
- The potential role of the Center for Research Libraries with regard to the original materials.

Leonard and his staff will discuss further with GTU.

With regard to the LBNL request, it was noted that:

- The journals may already be held by the UC Libraries, and may also be available digitally from their publishers, JSTOR, etc.
- The Research Reports may be amenable to digitization, especially if unique. The digital versions might then be eligible for deposit in the eScholarship Repository; in any case, it might be useful to encourage LBNL to participate in the Repository for their current Research Reports.
- Very rough calculations indicate the cost to deposit or digitize are comparable.

Leonard and his staff will discuss further with LBNL.

4. Open Content Alliance book scanning project (Update)

Background:

- (Distributed at the meeting) Open Content Alliance (OCA) Book Scanning Update (June 9, 2006)

Robin Chandler, the CDL's Director of Built Content, described the scanning operations in place and developing at the RLFs to support UC's participation in the Open Content Alliance program for digital reformatting of library collections, as well as the supporting plans and operations to identify collections for scanning, select and transport materials from campus library and RLF stacks, and coordinate submission to the UC Digital Preservation Repository. In discussion, the following observations were made:

- Many government document collections (especially California State documents) could be considered to fall within the rubric of early American imprints.
- There is substantial interest in scanning and making available the print transcriptions of oral histories created by the special collections departments at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and elsewhere, but doing so creates some challenges in obtaining the requisite permissions.
- There is strong interest in knowing when the special collections departments at campuses other than UCB and UCLA can begin to plan for participation in UC's large-scale digital reformatting projects.
- The ULs also requested that at least one book from each campus is included in this book scanning project.

5. Normalization of RLF circulation policies (Discussion/Action)

Background:

- Report of the SLFB Operations Task Force on Normalizing Circulation Periods between the RLFs (5/31/06)
- Circulation Categories at the Regional Library Facilities (11/8/05)
- Distribution of RLF Deposits by Format, Campus, and Circulation Status as of October 2005
- Letter from Nick Robinson (TALAG) to Bernie Hurley, March 23, 2006

The Board suggested a third alternative to the two set out in the OTF Report for dealing with current NRLF “Limited Circulation” materials ([i] retaining this category for deposits to date; or [ii] reviewing all materials in this category and reclassifying as either “Non-circulating” or “Building Use Only”). This third alternative is to ask the library that deposited a “Limited Circulation” item to review the material and reclassify it whenever it is requested from NRLF. As it is expected that these materials will be rarely requested, this procedure will minimize workload while effectively aligning the circulation policies of the two RLFs over time.

It is understood that no further “Limited Circulation” deposits will be accepted at NRLF. After the effective date of this procedure, all deposits at both RLFs must be designated by the depositing library as “Unrestricted,” “Non-circulating,” or “Building Use Only,” as these terms are defined in the OTF Report.

Action: The Board **endorsed** the adoption of uniform circulation policies for the RLFs as set out in the OTF Report and using the third option for addressing “Limited Circulation” materials at the NRLF, as set out above, **effective September 1, 2006** (moved: Schottlaender; seconded: Strong; unanimously endorsed). (NOTE: staff will incorporate the basic provisions of this procedure into the consolidated Operating Principles – see agenda item 1 above.)

6. SRLF Phase 3 (Update)

a. Inclusion in Capital Improvement Program

Background:

- University of California, 2006-07 Budget for Capital Improvements, pp. 182-3 (<http://budget.ucop.edu/capital/200607/200607-budgetforstatecapitalimprovements.pdf>)

Lawrence reviewed the general planning timeline for SRLF Phase 3, given its current placement in the UC five-year capital plan. Key dates include:

- Now—mid-2007: rationalization of collections; planning for scope and new services (by agreement with the Vice President for Budget)
- 2007-08 (optionally) development of a Detailed Project Plan (DPP)
- 2008-09 Development of a Program Planning Guide (PPG)
- May 2009 finalization of the 2010-11 capital budget request
- 2010-11 Planning
- 2011-12 Working drawings
- 2011-13 Construction
- 2013-14 Equipment

In discussion it was noted that:

- The schedule for SRLF-3 prior to finalization of the project could be accelerated or deferred

- The project schedule itself could be accelerated by combining steps (e.g. Planning and Working Drawings), depending on circumstances and the nature of the project.

b. RLF de-duplication analysis planning update

Hurley's early thinking about procedural steps for a de-duplication program, and accompanying challenges, includes:

- More precise definition and identification of duplicate holdings within and between the RLFs. The planning team will need assistance from CDL staff to extract needed data from the Melvyl database.
- Develop a procedure to select and process the duplicate item to be withdrawn. This may require some physical verification (of holdings, completeness and quality of each copy, perhaps transportation to allow physical comparison of copies), reconciliation of any differences in circulation policies and consideration of relevant circulation histories, etc., and procedures for updating bibliographic and inventory records at the RLFs. For journals and other items in series, a procedure for identifying gaps and locating and transferring copies to fill them may also be required.
- Develop a procedure to return the withdrawn duplicates to the depositing campuses. This step would appear to be necessary to ensure that (a) local campus records are appropriately updated and (b) the depositing campus receives proper credit for withdrawal in lieu of deposit.

In discussion, it was noted that:

- It would be exceptionally expensive and time-consuming to apply these procedures to individual monographic titles; serial runs are the obvious first priority.
- It is important to have more precise and verifiable data about the extent and nature of duplication within and between RLFs, and this should be given high priority. Several Board members opined that, owing to changes in the University administration and the University's budget picture, the priority for implementation of a de-duplication program is less clear, and therefore the development of implementing procedures should receive a lesser priority.

7. JSTOR project (Update)

Background:

- (Distributed at the meeting) The UCL/JSTOR Project at SRLF: Update for SLFB (6/9/06)

Nancy Kushigian, CDL Director of Shared Print Programs, described the process established at the SRLF to support the creation of the JSTOR print archive, discussed some lessons learned and continuing challenges, and indicated that negotiations are underway with JSTOR on extension of the program beyond the initial two-year project, which would involve both continued growth of the runs of titles in the existing archive and addition of new titles that have been digitized by JSTOR in the interim. Details of that negotiation will be informed by much more detailed and precise information about operation costs, gleaned from experience to date. Board members expressed interest in receiving periodic reports about progress in this project, and several were interested in learning more about its actual costs.