

## Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB)

Meeting Minutes  
Friday, September 29<sup>th</sup>, 2017

Chair: Jeffrey MacKie-Mason  
Note Taker: Danielle Westbrook

### Members in attendance:

Jeffrey MacKie-Mason (UCB)	Haipeng Li (UCM)	Alan Grosenheider (UCSB)	Cathy Martyniak (SRLF), non-voting
MacKenzie Smith (UCD)	Steve Mandeville-Gamble (UCR)	M. Elizabeth Cowell (UCSC)	Emily Stambaugh (CDL), non-voting
Lorelei Tanji (UCI)	Tammy Dearie (UCSD)	Günter Waibel (CDL)	
Virginia (Ginny) Steel (UCLA)	Chris Shaffer (UCSF)	Erik Mitchell (NRLF), non-voting	

**Regrets:** Kristine Ferry (UCI), Thomas Cogswell (UCR)

**Staff:** Danielle Westbrook (CDL)

Agenda Item	Time	Duration	Responsible	Documents/Notes	Outcome/Goal
1. HTSP MOU discussion	11:15-11:30	00:15	Jeff	- HathiTrust Shared Print Agreement Package (includes MOU)	Review and discuss.
2. Allocations implementation discussion	11:30-12:10	00:40	Jeff	- Allocations implementation proposal	Review, discuss and endorse.
3. RLF load balancing update	12:10-12:15	00:05	Cathy and Erik		

### 1. HathiTrust Shared Print program discussion

**Decision:** The SLFB supports CoUL's proposal that the HTSP agreement include a fourth option for early withdrawal, where the departing retention library retains committed holdings so long as they maintain their preservation and access commitment to the program/Trust through to the already specified end date (i.e. existing obligations are maintained, but the library leaves the HTSP program).

**Decision:** The SLFB supports proposing that the HTSP program's Operating Policies and Guidelines only be changed with mutual consent from retention libraries (mutual consent would be sought after the existing HT mechanisms for changing the policies/guidelines are carried out). This would likely result in a formal amendment to the agreement.

**Decision:** UC should clarify with HT that this is a legally binding agreement. Given the agreement's language alone, the Provost's office should likely have legal counsel review the agreement before the Provost signs.

**Action:** Jeff, Emily and Günter will determine how/when to present UC's proposals and question (as outlined above) to HT.

**Action:** ULs should continue to talk to faculty and socialize the HTSP program as appropriate. Should new concerns arise, contact Jeff and Emily.

## 2. RLF Allocations implementation discussion

Decision point #1 (The SLFB is asked to decide if UCLA/UCB should get a 'base' allocation)

**Decision:** SLFB endorses decision point #1.

Decision point #2 (The SLFB is asked to select a distribution method for allocations not set in decision 1)

**Decision:** Decision point 2, option 1, should be revised so that after the annual call, the allocation needs are summarized and posted for SLFB review. If the total requested allocations (including UCB and UCLA) are over the annual capacity, campuses have the opportunity to trade allocations to adjust the total so that it is equal to or less than annual capacity. If allocations are still over the annual capacity after the trading period, then the RLFs calculate the percentage that the total request is over with everyone getting that % reduction.

**Decision:** SLFB endorses decision point #2, option 1, with the edits noted above.

Decision point #3 (The SLFB is asked to approve a shift in RLF allocation tracking to bring the RLFs together in our metrics)

**Decision:** edit the archival box limit to 10% of the total annual allocations systemwide, and include an opportunity for campus archival box needs to be summarized and posted so that campuses may barter/trade to ensure the total annual capacity (10%) isn't surpassed. If archival box needs are still over the annual capacity after the trading period, then the RLFs calculate the percentage that the total request is over with everyone getting that % reduction. The call for allocations (decision point #2) will include campus needs for archival boxes and non-archival-boxes.

**Decision:** SLFB endorses decision point #3 with the edits noted above.

**Action:** one year after implementation, Cathy and Erik will review and report back to SLFB how the workflow around archival boxes, and the 10% limit, worked.

Decision point #4 (The SLFB is asked to approve an exceptional deposit policy in support of the new allocation model)

**Decision:** SLFB endorses decision point #4.

Other

**Action:** Cathy and Erik will review the operating procedures (developed in 2006) to determine if they're still applicable and to update if need be.

**Decision:** RLF procedures/documentation should typically be reviewed one year after implementation, then every five years moving forward. Issues can be raised at any time.

**3. RLF load balancing update**