

Shared Library Facilities Board
Conference Call
Oct. 13, 2013

Participants: Ginny Steel (Chair), Karen Butter, Elizabeth Cowell, Lorelei Tanji, Erik Mitchell, Bill Garrity (for Davis), Denise Stephens, Emily Stambaugh, Tom Cogswell, Kristine Ferry, Haipeng Li, Steve Mandeville-Gamble

Absent: Jeffrey MacKie-Mason, Brian Schottlaender, Ivy Anderson, SRLF Director (new director, Cathy Martyniak, starts Nov. 16)

Meeting Minutes

1. SLFB membership; mission and role review (Steel)

The Board had not met for a regular meeting for several years, but the emergence of several issues necessitated this meeting. Some housekeeping included reviewing and suggesting edits to the Board's charge:

1. Add Shared Print Manager as an ex officio member.
2. Edit the bullet points on budget to indicate high-level view. (There may be language in the SLASIAC charge re: CDL budget)

Action: Steel and Joanne Miller will work together to revise. Board members can vote over email or discuss at next call.

2. Review state of planning for future storage needs across UC (Mitchell)

Review of Iron Mountain storage business model; consideration of next steps (if any)

Space status for the RLFs show:

- NRLF projected to be full after FY17
- SRLF has about five more years (thanks to the Film and Television Archive's removal of their materials)

In the background document, Mitchell attempted to capture what actions the UC libraries are taking to address the need for more space, how they might move forward, and whether UC wants to move ahead with Iron Mountain.

This model of contracting with a third-party commercial company could be categorized as "storage as a service," and it is one flavor of the "public-private partnership" (or "P3") model supported by UC. Mitchell explained that there are some guidelines for exploring a potential partnership. For example, engaging in informational discussions is fine, but negotiating and agreeing to a contract are not permitted. Iron Mountain is conducting a library materials storage pilot project on the east coast, so UC

could wait to see the results of that pilot, and UCLA is talking to Iron Mountain about a local solution for special collections.

Other options for storage include building a new facility from scratch or adding on to NRLF (SRLF is no longer available for expansion). Financing options other than the P3 model include fundraising in order to pay up front for construction, or a new idea from UC Berkeley that all ten campuses try approaching UCOP for a loan wherein each library would commit for its share of the debt. This novel approach would have each UL talk to his/her provost, who would then go to the UCOP provost. SLFB would likely have to address questions around equity and whether the debt would be weighted more heavily toward those campuses that use more storage.

The Board asked about cost estimates for the different options and approved a lightweight modeling ("gateway") estimate for \$2,000 from UC Berkeley to help determine the real cost of a new building versus an NRLF expansion. [Note: NRLF was originally planned to be built in phases. Phase 3 was completed in 2005.] It is possible that input from an expert on library storage construction is required to accurately estimate the full cost of building an entirely new facility.

Currently, the cost for storing 14 million items is about \$3million/year, and in addition to this cost the libraries do not see the full cost for maintenance as some are absorbed by the university (Berkeley or UCLA). Iron Mountain's proposed charges are approximately \$0.50 per volume per year plus access fees, which would come out to \$7million (annually), plus the cost of transferring materials if all collections were moved. One Board member with experience with Iron Mountain and libraries warned that costs associated with withdrawal, access, and other services could escalate quickly.

Based on recent conversations and a conservative estimate from the Phase 3 build cost, Mitchell believes that UC can build its own facility for \$20million. According to UCB architects, a loan of that size divided equally comes out to \$100K/year for each library over a 25-30 year period. Additional operating expenses would also have to be funded. Mitchell was told that funding would need to be available or raised for operations.

Libraries that are paying for offsite storage now may not have the same desire for shared storage, depending on the costs and options. A larger discussion is needed regarding the ultimate purpose of the storage facilities and future storage projections.

In the proposal for UCOP, it will be important to make a convincing argument about the importance of collections, to show dire need, and to present a broad vision. The Board should go with the "big ask," for a major fix that will work for a number of years, or at least be expandable.

The letter from Provost Aimeé Dorr letter suggests that the libraries bring their recommendation to COVC. The Board could identify and rank the options and then put together a document for COVC (and SLASAC). The "big ask" would be one option.

Actions:

- Miller will send survey results on collections to SLFB. [Done] Mitchell will see if more information needs to be collected. Mitchell will draft questions and send back to SLFB. Once information is gathered, Mitchell will go ahead with getting a gateway estimate from UC Berkeley for \$2,000, which NRLF will fund.
- SLFB will meet again once there are cost numbers to review.

3. Review of capital planning process (Mitchell)

Review extent to which UC/RLFs are meeting goals stated in response letter

Current projects to address space shortages include a pilot for de-duplication of journal holdings across RLFs, digitization programs that remove items from facilities (e.g., FedArc), analyzing future space requirements, and a study of current RLF workflows.

Action: Mitchell will prepare a follow-up letter to SLFB (from himself as RLF director) that can be used in SLASIAC meeting and other places where necessary. There is no need to formally write back to Provost Dorr or EVC Waugh.

4. Review/Brainstorming ideas for influencing storage options (Stambaugh)

- a. Consideration of different types of storage for different types of materials.*
- b. Potential impact of national shared print partnerships.*

The Board did not have in depth discussion, but learned that UC is involved in national and regional partnerships for shared print collections that include development of frameworks for collection decisions that incorporate space needs and library retention commitments. UC is conducting an analysis of journal holdings to find out impact of shared print partnerships on the libraries' collections decisions.

Stambaugh noted that storage space is a critical issue across North America. Almost all storage facilities are fully occupied.

5. Information item: Review HathiTrust Monograph Shared Print proposal and UC response.

HathiTrust has 11 million digitized books and is now looking at putting together a print archive. The Shared Print Strategy Team is working on a high-level response to the report. CoUL has also asked the Strategy Team to look at implications and opportunities with HathiTrust.

Action: Stambaugh will keep SLFB updated as things progress.

6. Consider California State Library Microfilm Storage question from NRLF

State library microfilm has been at NRLF since 2006, but hasn't yet been accessioned. Pre-accessioning was done, and it's ready to store, but at some point a decision was made to put it into larger archival boxes, which changed the cost of storage. At 3,700 volume equivalents, the deposit cost comes to \$11,000.

Action: Mitchell will work with Mandeville-Gamble to correct the cost/price on the contract.

7. Information item: Comprehensive print journal holdings analysis for UC libraries

In the spring, the Shared Print Program did a collection analysis of print journal holdings in RLFs and campuses. A report will come out before the end of the year.

Action: Stambaugh will share results of the analysis with SLFB and other groups (such as the Shared Content Leadership Group (SCLG) in the new UCLAS structure.