

DRAFT

Planning for Alternatives – Space Issues at the RLFs

Prepared by Joanne Miller for the SLASIAC Meeting on May 21, 2009

The Issue: Diminishing capacity and approaching fill-dates of the RLFs

- SRLF: Capacity = 6.9 million volume equivalents; will be full in 2011 or 2012 (at current deposit rates), depending on how much space currently occupied by the Film and Television Archive (FATA) may be reclaimed for library deposits
- NRLF: Capacity = 7.55 million volume equivalents; will be full in 2015 (at current deposit rates)

Space planning in light of RLF capacity is part of the greater issue of shared collection management. Discussions about alternatives to regional storage space should take into account all of the components of the UC shared collections, including availability and affordances of alternative formats, digitized collections, services provided, extramural partnerships (such as [HathiTrust](#)), and the costs and benefits of the alternatives.

The groups and constituencies that should be consulted during the planning and implementation processes of any new programs include the Shared Library Facilities Board, the ULs, and SLASIAC.

Alternatives

1. **Consolidation of campus collections; e.g., collections with low use that are duplicated on many campuses such as government documents, retrospective journal collections, and others.**

Decisions should take into account the size (“footprint”) of the collections, usage, digital surrogates, and types of delivery services (such as print-on-demand).

2. **De-duplication**

It has been estimated that approximately 4% of the items held within each RLF, and an additional 9% (about 1 million items) of the combined holdings of the RLFs are duplicates. Of these, an estimated 460,000 volumes are true candidates for de-duplication. [From research conducted by the University Librarians’ Regional Library Facilities Planning Task Force in 2003-04. Some items with identical titles may not be duplicates, there may be archival grounds for maintaining two copies of certain items, and overlapping serial titles may not be complete journal runs at each facility.]

More detail, including cost estimates can be found in “Reducing Duplication and Enhancing Research Value at UC Regional Library Facilities: Preliminary Recommendations” (from Nancy Kushigian, former director of Shared Print Program, April 25, 2006).

DRAFT

3. **Greater percentage of collections kept/stored on campus or in local storage facilities (or, more withdrawals/weeding)**

The RLFs hold approximately 11 million volume equivalents.

More than 50% of the current annual collection growth is accommodated in the RLFs.

4. **Find regional or national options for shared print collections**

Next Steps

The UC Libraries' Systemwide Operations and Planning Advisory Group has recommended a Task Force on Collections Space Planning to identify opportunities for managing library space in a more coordinated fashion, investigate what other institutions are doing in the face of space constraints, and to provide recommendations for the future. The libraries will continue to monitor potential external projects such as the [Center for Research Libraries](#)' proposal for a regional shared print solution.

Note that additional relevant information can be found in the report, "An Initial Comparison of the Capital and Operating Costs for Long-Term Custody of Print and Digital Library Materials" prepared by Gary Lawrence, August 7, 2007. [[PDF](#)]