Microfilm - Calif Newspaper

Subject: RE: FW: CSL deposit of newspaper microfilm
Date: Tue, 17 Oct 2006 13:29:56 -0700
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
Thread-Topic: FW: CSL deposit of newspaper microfilm
Thread-index: AcbyJtGPErcfdJqkT8u9J/CWYg6YzAAA9F4A
From: <Gary.Lawrence@ucop.edu>
To: <scott@library.berkeley.edu>, <karen.butter@library.ucsf.edu>
Cc: <bernie@library.berkeley.edu>

Scott – thanks very much for this!

Karen – I'm assuming that a background package for a UL's item might consist of a copy of Hildreth's letter, and a lightly-reformatted version of Scott's report (e.g., to add the assumption that the CSL deposit could/should be stored in the North – at least as a point for discussion – and to clean up the original message trail). On this basis, would you like to proceed to place this on the 10/25 agenda?

- gsl

From: Scott Miller [mailto:scott@library.berkeley.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, October 17, 2006 1:00 PM
To: Gary Lawrence
Cc: karen.butter@library.ucsf.edu; bernie@library.berkeley.edu
Subject: Re: FW: CSL deposit of newspaper microfilm

Gary,

Assuming 8,000 - 14,000 standard 3-1/2" diameter reels housed in 4"x4"x1-3/4" acid-free microfilm boxes:

Costs:
Accessioning Fees @ $1.75/item: $14,000 - $24,500, one-time
Annual Fees @ $0.08/VE/yr (2,174 - 3,804 VE): $174 - $304 per year
Remote Borrowing Fees @ $2.05 per item + delivery cost

Space Impact:
Assuming that these are archival masters, NRLF's remaining archival microfilm cabinet space will accommodate 22,000 reels. CSL's reels would occupy 36% - 64% of the remaining space. Note that once The Bancroft Library moves its surge collection back to the UCB campus in 2008(?), NRLF will have properly conditioned (i.e., 30% RH) shelf space for an additional 90,000 reels of microfilm.

Policy Issues:
- I'm not aware of a UC library policy requiring storage of archival masters and their working copies in different facilities. Prior to construction of SRLF Phase 1 in 1987, UCB stored three generations of microfilm (archival masters, printing masters, and use copies) at NRLF. Since then, UCB has stored its archival masters at SRLF. Obviously this is good risk management practice, but I'm not sure that it's dictated by policy.

- Since these are archival master microfilms and therefore special collections, access to them is limited to CSL. Pertinent policy is SOP 3.1.1 (Non-Circulating...).
- Also in SOP 3.1.1: "Non-UC libraries requesting lending services are charged for those services on a cost recovery basis."
- The *Non-University of California Participation Fee Schedule* says, "There are two basic programs in which non-UC institutions may participate: the Deposits Program and the Access Program. It is assumed that libraries participating in the Deposits Program will need to participate in the Access Program. The following description of fees applies to those institutions that participate in both programs. Different access fees apply to those non-UC libraries that participate in only the Access Program (Interlibrary Borrowing). ...Access fees are charged to the library requesting a service on behalf of a patron. Access fees are charged irrespective of what library deposited the material requested. The [access] fees below are available only to depositing libraries..." This implies that libraries that participate in both the Deposits and Access Programs can borrow not only their own materials but also any unrestricted UC materials housed at the RLF.

--Scott

At 10:40 AM 10/16/2006, Gary.Lawrence@ucop.edu wrote:

Colleagues – just checkin' in, to see if there might be some space/cost info from NRLF to accompany this agenda item, should Karen decide to include it on the agenda for the 10/25 UL meeting....

TIA,

- gsl

From: Gary Lawrence
Sent: Wednesday, October 04, 2006 3:47 PM
To: 'Bernie Hurley'; 'Scott Miller'
Cc: 'Karen Butter'; Tom Leonard (toml@berkeley.edu); Daniel Greenstein
Subject: CSL deposit of newspaper microfilm

Dear Bernie and Scott – I just received, by way of Karen Butter, the attached letter from State Librarian Susan Hildreth to Ruth Jackson related to the deposit of CSL's California Newspaper Project microfilms in a UC RLF.

This letter addresses one component of Ruth's May 24 inquiry to Karen (http://www.slp.ucop.edu/uls/060906_SLFB/rj_to_kab_email.doc) regarding deposit of CNP microfilm, i.e., "8,000-14,000 reels/rolls of microfilm ... from the California State Library which no longer has an offsite storage facility at BMI to house these resources."

As Karen is considering taking this matter to the ULs at their October 25 conference call, I would like to ask you **if it would be feasible** for you, by **October 18**, to (a) provide an estimate of the cost and space impact to process these at NRLF as non-UC deposits (making whatever assumptions you think necessary to support that estimate and with consideration of the income derived from CSL for this service), and (b) identify any additional issues that the ULs should

consider in evaluating a request to accept this deposit.

Obiter dictum,

- Hildreth's letter makes clear that CSL plans to retain ownership of the material. For planning purposes, I believe this statement decouples the CSL deposit from consideration of any of the other deposits discussed in Ruth's 5/24 message, and as CSL is already an NRLF depositor, enables us to consider this prospective request as (a) a request for a non-UC deposit (b) at NRLF. There may be compelling reasons to collocate these materials with those proposed for deposit by UCR, but as distance per se seems no longer to be a significant factor in our collection planning, I think that the assumption of deposit at NRLF is a reasonable point of departure. We can allow the ULs' discussion to surface the relative merits of physical collocation vs. the cost to SRLF of setting up the contractual, processing, and physical arrangements required to accept deposits from CSL.
- Some of the issues raised in the Board's June 9 discussion of Ruth's inquiry (http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/about/slfb/SLFB_meeting_notes_2006-06-09_final.html), such as UC library policies respecting deposit of archival masters and working copies of archival microforms, are not addressed here and will need to be worked out with the parties. You might want to articulate this further in your identification of issues (especially as they bear on non-UC deposits), as you both are more knowledgeable than I in these matters.
- I'm not sure whether current policies respecting access to (a) non-UC deposits or (b) microform formats present any possible issues here. It might be useful in the identification of issues to articulate the applicable policies for the benefit of the ULs, in case such questions arise.
- In my view, Hildreth's letter does not in itself constitute a request to deposit, but merely the opening of a dialog. I assume that any information we develop at this time is in support of that dialog; any negotiations with CSL toward a binding deposit agreement can only occur at the direction of the Board.

Thanks in advance, and please let me know if you have any questions (that I might be able to answer).

Gary S. Lawrence, DLIS
Director, Systemwide Library Planning
University of California, Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street, 11th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Voice: (510) 987-9461
Fax: (510) 587-6401
Internet: gary.lawrence@ucop.edu
Web: http://www.slp.ucop.edu
