

Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force Final Report To the University Librarians

February 13, 2004

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| I. | Introduction..... | 1 |
| II. | Background..... | 2 |
| III. | Issues & Recommendations..... | 4 |
| A. | Governance, Planning, and Budgeting..... | 4 |
| 1. | Governance..... | 4 |
| 2. | Budgets and Financial Management..... | 5 |
| 3. | Capacity Planning and Capital Budgeting..... | 5 |
| 4. | RLF Management..... | 6 |
| B. | Current Policies and Operations..... | 6 |
| 1. | Duplication of Deposits..... | 6 |
| 2. | Persistence and Availability of Deposits..... | 8 |
| 3. | Credit for Withdrawal in Lieu of Deposit..... | 9 |
| 4. | Physical Condition of Volumes..... | 9 |
| 5. | An RLF Serving the Entire University..... | 10 |
| 6. | Non-UC Depositors..... | 10 |
| C. | New Service Initiatives..... | 10 |
| IV. | Conclusion..... | 11 |

I. Introduction

The University Librarians appointed the Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force in April 2003, with a charge to develop and propose an action plan for the future of the UC Regional Library Facilities. The plan was to include consideration of shared space requirements and storage for the UC libraries including the types of needs for the next ten years; consideration of the issues surrounding use of the RLFs by non-UC institutions; management and governance of the two facilities including consideration of one board instead of two; new initiatives for the facilities which would maximize the effective use of space and staff and meet current and emerging library service needs; consideration of possible roles for the RLFs in supporting shared collection management strategies; and a funding model for the facilities including protocol for requesting support for new initiatives or dealing with budget reductions.

It was not the intention of the ULs that the Task Force would resolve each of the issues, but rather would identify all the key issues, recommend the most appropriate planning process or working group to address each issue, make specific recommendations where appropriate, and provide analysis that would be used by the various other working groups as they undertake comprehensive programmatic planning.

Task Force members were:

Karen Butter, Task Force Co-Chair; Chair, Northern Regional Library Board; UL-UCSF
 Gerald Munoff, Task Force Co-Chair, Chair, Southern Regional Library Board; UL-UCI
 Cynthia Shelton, CMPG Steering Committee representative; AUL-UCLA
 Dan Greenstein, University Librarian for Systemwide Library Planning
 Claire Belanti, SRLF manager; Director, Library Resource Sharing & SLRF, UCLA
 Bernie Hurley, NRLF manager; Director for Library Technologies & Director, NRLF, UCB
 Sheryl Davis, LAUC representative; Head of Preservation Services, UCR

Gary Lawrence, Director, Systemwide Library Planning, provided critical staff support. The work of the Task Force was further supported by a compendium of data about RLF collections, services and budgets compiled by the RLF Directors, and a collection of historical documents related to RLF planning and policy assembled by Director Lawrence.

II. Background

The two Regional Library Facilities (RLFs) at Berkeley and Los Angeles provide secure, climate-controlled low-cost space to accommodate infrequently used materials of enduring research value deposited by campus libraries from their collections. The RLFs were completed and occupied in the early 1980s and expanded in the early 1990s (an additional expansion for the Northern Regional Library Facility is scheduled for occupancy in 2005). Current holdings of the facilities total about 10 million volumes. All Regional Facility holdings are included in the Melvyl Online Union Catalog, their collections are extensively used, and the RLFs have been thoroughly integrated into the operations and services of all campuses and of Universitywide systems. With the establishment of the RLFs, the continued availability of RLF space was fully integrated into the long-term capital plans of libraries and campuses.

Since their inception, the Regional Libraries have played a pivotal support role in strengthening the campus libraries' ability to provide high quality collections and services to UC faculty and students through cooperation, coordination, and collaboration. In this time of rapidly changing information technologies, expanding scholarly publication in various formats, and the need to maximize the utilization of current library space, it is necessary to make plans for the future of the regional library facilities that anticipate a dynamic and continually evolving environment and will require the continuation of important existing programs, and the development of new roles as well.

In 1977, when the RLFs were first conceived, their role consisted primarily of providing secure, high-quality, low-cost space for infrequently-used print materials of continuing research value deposited by the campus libraries in each region; and providing the services required to process and control the deposited material, and to retrieve and deliver items to the requesting library. While the range of services offered by the RLFs has expanded over the last 25 years, and the locus of management responsibility has changed,¹ the basic role has remained unchanged.

Characteristics of this role include:

- The main relationship was between each RLF and its depositing campus libraries, so governance was organized regionally.
- Each depositing library retained "ownership" and control of the materials it deposited, subject to operating policies and principles agreed to by the libraries in the service region.
- Limited Systemwide coordination and integration were required, and were achieved at the policy level by the University Librarians and representation of the Office of the President on the Regional Library Boards. Systemwide integration of services was provided by inclusion

¹ When the RLFs were first implemented in the late 1970s, they were located administratively at the Office of the President, with a separate Regional Library Board for each, to set policy and provide oversight. In 1993, Berkeley and UCLA were given responsibilities for budgeting and operations for the NRLF and SRLF, respectively. Operational budgets were transferred from OP to the host campuses, but without a mechanism for enhancements to these budgets except for the routine allocation of salary range and merit and price increase funds administered according to the host campus' budget processes.

of RLF holdings in the MELVYL union catalog and by courier service for rapid regional and Universitywide delivery of materials requested from the facilities.

- The budget and administrative decisions for each RLF chiefly affected the libraries in that region, so it was feasible to assign management responsibility for each facility to its host campus, subject to the policy oversight of their respective Boards, more or less independent of each other.

In 2003 the University Librarians made a major commitment to enhance resources for faculty and students through a joint strategy for significantly increased sharing of print collections and building shared print collections for the UC libraries. This greatly expands the collaborative strategy for development of the UC libraries that began in 1977 and accelerated with establishment of the California Digital Library (CDL) in 1997. The University Librarians group will oversee and govern these activities. They have initiated planning for programs that will require richer, more complex, and interdependent systems for optimizing collections and services, and will rely on the following tenets.

- Sharing campus collections and creating shared UC Libraries collections and related services will play a far greater role in the ongoing operations of the UC libraries.
- Campus libraries' collections are increasingly interdependent, and rely on support from centralized and shared services like the CDL, and on shared resources like the RLFs. Decisions made in any one component may affect others, and ultimately may affect the entire UC library system.
- New technologies and approaches have opened up opportunities for campus libraries to enhance collaborative sharing of collections and services. These include, shared digital collections, shared print collections, prompt physical delivery or electronic desktop delivery of requested items, and shared technical infrastructure to permit efficient development and operation of locally customized library services of all kinds.

The University Librarians understand that the success of this collaborative strategy relies, in part, on the pivotal support roles the RLFs play. To achieve these plans, current RLF functions must be sustained, and new responsibilities, which build on existing strengths and complement campus initiatives, must be undertaken by the RLFs.

Collections

The materials held in the RLFs are strong research collections of high value, and are an essential factor in the quality of the University of California. Nevertheless, questions are regularly raised about the quality of the 8 million items currently deposited in the UC Regional Library Facilities and the degree of duplication within and between them.

There are at least two important indicators of the ongoing value of RLF materials for research and teaching. First, the RLF collections are of very high quality. It is important to remember that the campus library collections are systematically and carefully developed by skilled and knowledgeable specialist librarians; initially for inclusion in the collection, and subsequently for retention and deposit in the RLF. Both steps are done in consultation with faculty, at faculty request, or as a result of a librarian's comprehensive and detailed knowledge of the academic programs and the research and instructional needs of the campus. The collections of the UC Libraries are skillfully and actively managed, and material without enduring value is routinely identified and weeded from the collections. For example, according to UC Library Statistics,

over 260,000 volumes were withdrawn from the collections in 2000-01, only 57,000 of which were duplicates of items already on deposit at the RLFs. For more on items withdrawn in lieu of deposit, see Section III.B.1 below. Only material with enduring research value is considered for deposit in the RLFs.

Second, materials deposited in the RLFs are extensively used. In 2001-02, about 200,000 items were borrowed or photocopied from the RLF collections. This significant annual level of use is nearly four times greater than the 53,154 items borrowed by the UC libraries from all other libraries nationwide on interlibrary loan during the same period. If the RLFs were not available to house these materials and they had been discarded, we would incur costs of nearly \$1.2 million per year to borrow them from other libraries.² The faculty consider interlibrary loan to be a basic and essential tool for their teaching and research, and loans from the RLFs even more so.

The library collections of the University of California are unequalled by other research collections and are the envy of the worldwide scholarly community. Materials deposited in the RLFs are essential and regularly used components of this world-class collection. There should be no question of the value of this unique resource, that past institutional support for the RLFs has been well spent, and that continued investments are essential for the excellence of the University.

III. Issues & Recommendations

The consensus of the Task Force was that its highest priorities were to position the RLFs for maximum flexibility and effectiveness in the emerging environment of collaborative sharing of collections and services among the UC Libraries, while preserving and enhancing important current services and programs. In addition, there are a number of problems and inconsistencies in the current policies of the RLFs that may affect both current operations and new service offerings. Some of these issues will be directly addressed, and others will be superseded by new approaches or resolved as procedures are developed or revised in the context of planning by various groups for the governance, development, and operation of enhanced sharing of collections and shared collections and services.

A. Governance, Planning, and Budgeting

1. Governance.

New RLF roles in support of the increasingly collaborative programs of the UC Libraries require a higher degree of coordination, consultation, and integration, both between the two RLFs and with all the campus libraries. Separate governance of the RLFs at the regional level does not provide the necessary level of coordination; one simplified and flexible governing structure is needed. Planning is now underway, under the oversight and governance of the University Librarians, for new collaborative services that will involve the RLFs. The Task Force believes that the specifics of governance of the RLFs are best defined as part of these planning processes.

Recommendation #1: Create a simple, agile governance structure that can oversee and make, or recommend as appropriate, decisions about policy, planning, operations, and financing of the

² At \$22 per transaction, based on a 1996-97 national study of interlibrary lending costs conducted by the Association of Research Libraries, adjusted for inflation.

RLFs within the structure of the University Librarians' governance of sharing and shared collections and services. The Task Force recommends consideration of a single RLF Board with responsibilities similar to the two existing Regional Boards. There is likely to be a continuing need as well for an operational body for each RLF that can provide planning guidance and recommend operational policy with respect to each facility's general operations and administration and its ongoing role as a repository for the campuses in its region.

Action: University Librarians to discuss and develop action plans.

2. *Budgets and Financial Management*

The current method of budget administration for the RLFs has worked reasonably well in sustaining their historic role, but new systemwide roles for the RLFs will require a different approach. Also, recent budget reductions, conducted according to the different guidelines of the two host campuses, have raised concerns. Last year, the chair of the NRLF Board wrote to Provost King expressing concern "that divergent and uncoordinated decisions about budgetary support for the two facilities could undermine Systemwide library programs and plans in which both RLFs play a key role."

To the extent that effective collection management initiatives call for one RLF to provide services that are not duplicated at the other facility (for example, the Elsevier/ACM Shared Print Journal pilot project hosted by SRLF), it is not reasonable, nor sustainable, to ask one host campus to undertake this additional financial burden alone. It is important that host campus budget managers have an understanding of how local budget decisions about the RLFs reach beyond the campus, and that these effects increasingly will be felt not just within the region, but Systemwide. RLF financing needs to be flexible, adaptable to the needs of the campuses, and managed with recognition of the evolution of the RLFs as support resources for new Universitywide strategies.

Recommendation #2: Recognizing the essential role that host campus budget managers play in the budgeting and administration of the RLFs, the RLF Board and the host ULs, in conjunction with the University Librarians group, SLASIAC, and other appropriate groups, should keep the key administrative officers of all the campuses, but especially the host campuses, including the Executive Vice Chancellors and Budget and Planning Officers, well informed on the importance of RLF programs.

Action: To the agenda for the RLF Board.

Recommendation #3: A strategy is needed to obtain supplemental funds from a variety of sources, including systemwide funds, to support new RLF roles, recognizing the budget management roles and responsibilities that are currently in place.

Action: To the agenda for the RLF Board and the ULs.

Recommendation #4: A strategy is needed to manage in a coordinated way the funds that support systemwide RLF programs that affect all campuses.

Action: To the agenda for the RLF Board and the ULs.

3. *Capacity Planning and Capital Budgeting*

In 1977, plans for regional storage capacity were based on linear projections of the growth of print collections at the contributing campuses. In 2003, capacity planning must continue to be based on projections for continuing campus deposits, but also must be regularly re-evaluated to

take into account the effects of rapidly-changing information technologies, for example, the availability and suitability of digital formats as substitutes for print, the increased emphasis on preserving print as a prudent safeguard for the fragility and questionable durability of the digital, and the development of new collaborative collection management programs, such as shared print journals. The detailed implications of these trends and complex interdependencies for library space planning and capital budgeting cannot be predicted with certainty, and will depend on programmatic decision regarding collections and services as well as the ongoing changes in technology and the information marketplace. Nevertheless, the traditional function of providing space and support for campus libraries to deposit print materials must continue and these deposits are anticipated to increase beyond historic levels as campus print collections continue to grow. In addition, supplemental space must be provided for supporting greater sharing of collections, and to build appropriate shared collections.

Recommendation #5: In view of the complex factors and interactions with campus libraries that bear on planning for RLF space, both now and in a future that likely will feature new collection stewardship and service responsibilities, new and more sophisticated methods will be needed to assess and account for the effects of technological change in planning RLF capacity needs and utilization. Current assessments and accurate projections are needed for operational and capital planning for the continuation of campus deposits, as well as to take advantage of new initiatives for shared collections and services.

Action: To the agenda for the RLF Board.

4. RLF Management.

The Task Force affirms that the current management structure of the RLFs has served the UC libraries well and can ensure effective performance of their current roles and those that can be reasonably anticipated. New initiatives may affect RLF operations, organization, and staffing.

Recommendation #6: The new governing structure should work closely with RLF managers during this period of evolution and ensure an enhanced level of consultation, coordination, and collaboration between the RLFs. Consideration should be given to the use of one or separate operations committees as appropriate.

Action: RLF Board, RLF managers, and host ULs.

B. Current Policies and Operations

1. Duplication of Deposits

The policies of the RLFs incorporate the principal of non-duplication articulated in the University's 1977 Library Plan, and consequently there is a very low level of duplication of materials within and between the RLFs. Some duplication is planned for a variety of reasons, including the use, value, and condition of the materials. Planned duplication may be desirable, for example, when current or anticipated use is sufficiently frequent (e.g., when a "use copy" is needed periodically to support a particular course), when an item has unusually great economic or scholarly value, or when all known copies are fragile (allowing one or more copies to be set aside as "insurance" against the deterioration of the others). Some duplication results from library catalog records that cannot always permit the unambiguous identification of exact duplicate deposits. However, campus libraries are particularly careful not to deposit duplicate copies, and in fact, over 540,000 volumes that campus libraries wished to deposit in an RLF were instead withdrawn from the campus collections but not deposited to an RLF because they

were duplicates of volumes already on deposit in an RLF³. Nevertheless, as a practical matter, a certain amount of duplication in any collection of over 8 million volumes, and especially one that is built consortially, is inevitable and, as discussed below, it would cost more to eliminate duplicates than to manage them.

Still, the level of duplication within facilities is much lower than would be expected. According to a recent estimate from the SRLF, only 4% of total items on deposit there are duplicates of other deposited items; a similar estimate from NRLF indicates that that only about 4% of total NRLF holdings are duplicate deposits. This is a very low number for the scale and complexity of the University.

The library plan developed in 1977 focused on storage services provided at the regional level, and therefore did not contemplate the issue of duplication between the two RLFs. Recent analyses using data from the Melvyl online union catalog and reasonable assumptions about the extent of monographic and periodical holdings at the two facilities suggests that only about 9% of items may be held at both RLFs.

Elimination of existing duplication of stored material is impractical due to the high cost and operational difficulties. In addition, it would not be efficient in that the space freed by discarding these duplicates could not be used to accommodate a like number of new deposits⁴.

While elimination of existing intra- and inter-regional duplication could, in theory, add 1 or even 2 years to the collective life expectancy of the RLFs at current deposit rates, the operating costs could be as high as \$5 million,⁵ and would place an enormous strain on the RLFs. In addition, due to the storage system, the space freed by discarding these duplicates could not be used effectively to accommodate a like number of new deposits.

However, the UC Libraries are both prepared and well positioned to minimize unplanned duplication in both retrospective projects and future deposits. As various projects are undertaken that include current RLF deposits, the opportunity will be taken to “de-duplicate” those portions of the collection. For the future, existing and planned improvements in UC bibliographic and technical processing systems, along with greatly strengthened organizational provisions for interlibrary collaboration, provide the tools to minimize unplanned duplication between the RLFs.

Recommendation #7: In the future operation of the RLFs' current services, and in planning for new collection management strategies and services that involve the RLFs, every opportunity should be taken a) to reduce unplanned duplication of holdings within and between the RLFs,

³ University of California Libraries, campus statistical reports, Schedule B, 2001-02, available from the Office of Systemwide Library Planning.

⁴ As materials in the RLFs are stored in the order received, organized by size, and double-shelved (books two rows deep on a single industrial-grade shelf), there is no guarantee that the spaces made available by the discarded materials, which could be scattered widely among the shelves of the RLFs, could effectively accommodate new incoming deposits.

⁵ These costs include identification and selection, updating of inventory and catalog records, and physical disposal. In 1990 the University adopted a standard fee for use with non-UC depositors of \$5.25 per volume for deaccession of deposits from the RLFs. Adjusting this fee for inflation using the California Consumer Price Index change from 1990 to 2003 results in an estimated current value of \$7.40 per volume. Applying this adjusted fee to the 921,000 stored duplicates in the system yields an estimated cost of \$6,815,000.

and b) as part of the planning for shared collection management strategies and programs, to define the nature and level of planned duplication that may be required to meet the archival and service responsibilities of the UC libraries, and the role of the RLFs in housing planned duplicates.

Action: RLF Board, ULs, SOPAG.

2. Persistence and Availability of Deposits

The continuing availability of materials that have been deposited in an RLF is essential to the effective sharing of materials and campus libraries' collection management. It will also be a critical issue in building shared collections, which will be addressed by other planning processes. The current RLF policies and procedures do not provide assurance of the persistence of deposits, as the depositing campus library has no obligation to keep a volume on deposit at the RLF nor even to retain in a campus collection a volume that previously had been deposited at an RLF but was returned to the campus. This may cause difficulties for a campus library that withdraws volumes from its campus collection, with the intention of depending on continued access to a copy on deposit at an RLF, only to have that copy withdrawn from the RLF by the depositing library. Flexible procedures that insure the greatest degree of persistent and equitable access are needed in order to make reliance on the deposited copy feasible. As the UC Libraries continue to expand the sharing of collections and develop shared collections, the RLFs can and should play a central role in planning for and the provision of persistent physical collections.

The following scenario exemplifies both the issues that arise and the procedures that might be developed to balance the assurance of persistence and access with flexibility for campus libraries to manage their deposits. Campus library "A" selects a volume in its collection for deposit at an RLF, but finds that the item is already on deposit at the RLF from another campus. Due to the policy of non-duplication, campus library "A" does not deposit its copy (a second copy) at the RLF. Campus library "A" may choose to keep the volume in its campus collections, or may withdraw the volume and register itself as an "RLF Partner Library" for the volume on deposit, together with the Depositing Campus Library and any other registered Partner Libraries. This procedure would be governed by the following:

A. Each campus library agrees that for all of its volumes deposited at an RLF, now and in the future, none will be withdrawn, preferably from deposit at the RLF, but minimally from inclusion in the depositing library's campus collections, without the agreement of all the campus Partner Libraries.

B. In addition to indicating the original Depositing Campus Library, the catalog record in the Melvyl union catalog and the depositing and partner campus catalogs will record all "Partner Libraries," that is, all campus libraries who have withdrawn that title from their campus collection in lieu of deposit in an RLF due to the existing deposit of the identical title. This will ensure that the original deposited copy is not accidentally withdrawn and also provides information to appropriately credit the volume(s) to the partner campus for counting purposes. (This is part of "credit for withdrawal in lieu of deposit" affirmed by the Task Force – see section III.B.3 below.)

C. Borrowing terms for partner volumes will be the same for the partner campus libraries as they are for depositing campus library.

D. The original depositing campus library will continue to bear responsibility to preserve the physical volume and maintain its bibliographic record.

Recommendation #8: Establish specific policies and operational agreements that can be implemented immediately to insure the persistence and availability of RLF deposits, and that will allow us to move forward in effective ways that will benefit all the campus libraries, regardless of future developments regarding the building of shared collections. The policies and agreement should address all the issues raised in the preceding scenario.

Action: ULs, NRLF, SRLF

3. *Credit for Withdrawal in Lieu of Deposit*

The Task Force reaffirmed the ULs' sense of the importance of the concept of credit for withdrawal in lieu of deposit (with consideration for systemwide planning needs). This concept has been further validated by new ARL statistical reporting procedures that adopt UC's approach. This question is, however, deeply imbedded in the complex of issues related to the governance, custody, and counting of shared information resources that has emerged in the context of planning for shared print collections. The Task Force notes that these issues, which are fundamental to progress in developing new collaborative strategies, and are important to framing the RLFs' roles in those strategies, continue to present a barrier even in the case of the facilities' traditional role in collection management. While the non-duplication policy of the RLFs reduces duplication among materials on deposit, it is important that those deposits be governed according to procedures that insure all campus libraries can make optimal selection decisions.

Recommendation #9: Establish formal procedures for the counting and reporting of collections both internally to UC and to external bodies (e.g. ARL) that incorporates credit for withdrawals in lieu of deposit to an RLF.

Action: ULs, Systemwide Library Planning

4. *Physical Condition of Volumes*

Overall, the physical condition of the volumes in both RLFs is quite good. However, as libraries increasingly rely on the deposits in the RLFs and in shared collections that will be developed, it is important that the items in such collections be in good physical condition. The Task Force notes that the issues of providing good copies are different for prospective and retrospective collections. A comprehensive program to identify and replace deposited copies for incrementally better copies in the retrospective collections would be prohibitively expensive for only potentially small improvement. However, any program that involves handling and review of the retrospective collections presents opportunities to identify items in poor condition and replace them with "good copies." For prospective collections, procedures should be considered that insure at least a good copy, if not the best copy available, is on deposit. The report of the Task Force on Collaborative Strategies for Archiving of Print in the Digital Environment⁶ identifies some of the principles and operational issues associated with a program of incremental identification and substitution of "good copies."

⁶ *Developing a "Copy of Record": Archiving Pilot Project for the University Of California*, February 2, 2000, revised by SOPAG, 2/25/00; available at <http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/sopag/cstf/CSTF_Final_Report_Rev.html>.

Recommendation #10: As part of any project for the systematic handling of the retrospective collections or the planning for any shared collection, procedures should be included for identifying poor copies and effecting replacements. A procedure should be developed for new deposits to the RLFs that identifies volumes in poor condition. This will allow Partner Libraries to offer as a replacement their good copy that otherwise will be withdrawn in lieu of deposit.
Action: RLF Board, ULs.

5. *An RLF Serving the Entire University*

Campus libraries will continue to deposit to their assigned regional depository as the primary procedure. However, owing to new technologies and governing structures that make speed and quality of service less dependent on physical proximity to an RLF, it is now possible to more reasonably consider locating a service or collection in only one RLF, while making it available to all campus libraries, a strategy that could be particularly effective for specialized services and facilities, and the development of shared collections. An example is the pilot Elsevier/ACM shared archival print journal collection, which serves all campuses and will be housed initially at SRLF. The same factors also suggest that some routine campus deposits could be placed in either RLF if operational considerations dictated.

Recommendation #11: Subject to considerations of service, governance, capacity, operational feasibility, and relevant policies pertaining to planned duplication, there should be no restriction on the ability of a campus to deposit materials from its collection, or for the UC Libraries collectively to deposit a shared print collection or establish a systemwide service, at either of the RLFs.

Action: RLF Board, ULs

6. *Non-UC Depositors*

There is more than sufficient demand from the campuses to fill available and anticipated RLF space. Although the RLF operating principles call for at least 10% of the facilities to be reserved for non-UC deposits, in reality the few deposits from other institutions have not approached this level and, with one minor exception, have been temporary. In view of the history of non-UC participation and the increasing needs of the campus libraries, the full capacity of the RLFs should be made available for campus deposits and shared collections and services.

Recommendation #12: Following current policy and practice, all non-UC requests will be handled by the RLF Board on a case-by case basis to determine if a deposit is to be accepted, and if so, on a temporary or permanent basis. However, the requirement of reserving space for non-UC deposits should be set aside.

Action: Recommendation from the NRLF and SRLF Boards, and the University Librarians, to Provost King.

C. New Service Initiatives

The RLFs are essential not only to the UC libraries' abilities to share collections and to build shared collections, but also to the provision of shared services. Increasingly, it will be possible and desirable for each region to provide selected new services to all the UC libraries. Before the RLFs can realize this potential, it will be necessary both to a) resolve the issues addressed previously in this report, and b) proceed further with the planning of the new service initiatives in which the RLFs can play a part.

The roles that the RLFs can best play will be identified through planning for each new collaborative service. Every plan for new services should consider the role the RLFs can play. The Task Force envisions that new roles will be developed for each RLF that build on existing strengths and complement campus libraries by enhancing services, reducing redundancy, and strengthening collections. These specialized roles, supporting both existing operations and future services, will help to realize more effective and efficient use of resources on a systemwide basis.

Among the collection management, technical service, and public service functions anticipated for shared initiatives in which the RLFs could take a role are (but are not limited to):

- Building shared collections
- Housing
- Processing, managing, tracking
- Public services
- Preservation
- Ordering and receiving
- Digitization
- Bibliographic services

Recommendation #13: The RLFs have the potential to provide effective and efficient services needed by all the campus libraries. Consideration of new service initiatives the RLFs can perform in support of sharing or shared collections and of the UC Libraries should be undertaken in the context of the specific planning for each of those collections and services. Planning should consider the range of existing strengths and new functions that might be located at one or both of the RLFs, and the financial, operational, staffing and space implications for the RLFs of adopting new roles. Every group planning new initiatives should be charged to consider appropriate shared services the RLFs can provide.

Action: ULs, SOPAG; RLF Board.

IV. Conclusion

Materials deposited in the RLFs are essential components of the world-class library collections of the University of California. The ability to continue to house infrequently-used research materials in shared, low cost, high quality storage allows the University Libraries affordably to sustain their role in support of the University's unexcelled research and teaching programs, and to continue to make the benefits of UC's premier information assets available to the people of California. As the UC Libraries begin to move aggressively into a new phase of collaborative resource and service development and sharing, the RLFs can once again play a pivotal role in advancing cost-effective and innovative services that further leverage our resources. Addressing and resolving the governance, budgeting and policy issues set forth in this report will provide the essential foundation for the RLFs to realize their potential in the emerging environment of highly collaborative library services.