

History of SLFB and SLFB-related CoUL discussions from 2012-2015

July 2012

RLF deposit recommendations

CoUL convened as the Shared Library Facilities Board (SLFB) and accepted recommendations from RLF directors for 2012-13, with the exception of 2D (“Compare RLF journal holdings to WEST Bronze archives outside the UC; identify the duplicate holdings for discard.”) **Action:** Schottlaender will confirm with SLFB LAUC representative and communicate SLFB decisions to RLF directors.

February 2013

Space Planning: SRLF 3

UCLA has completed the feasibility study and Strong is working with the campus to identify how to fund SRLF3. The building will include not only storage of collections but workspace for UCLA Library technical services staff that are currently in a temporary space. There is still the option for other campuses to contribute to the cost in exchange for stack space.

ACTION:

- Invite Provost Aimee Dorr to June CoUL meeting to discuss concerns about shared space issues and how to get the need for such space back on the UCOP agenda
- Campuses should complete all the questions in the space survey by March 15
- J. Miller will work with Schottlaender to analyze data for discussion at the CoUL June meeting, and Schottlaender will facilitate that discussion.
- Discuss the impact of PDA on acquisitions budgets at June meeting

SLFB convened by Schottlaender

ACTION:

- Southern campuses must stay within their allocations until 2014 when FATA moves
- Authorized the RLF directors to develop a plan for de-duping journal titles between SRLF and NRLF and with the WEST Bronze archives

October 2013:

SLFB-related, but discussed by CoUL

CoUL endorsed the Shared Print Strategic Plan, which included as part of its organizational model that the “Shared Print Manager serves on the Shared Library Facilities Board...”

Sept. 2014:

CoUL/COLD update / Shared print (space and shared resources)

- No further updates since our last meeting. SRLF expansion is almost certainly off the table. UCB is studying NRLF and the possibilities for a Richmond facility.
- CoUL will work with Susan Carlson and SLASIAC to explore how major capital projects that benefit the system, not just single campuses, are approached at UC these days. Susan will reach out internally at OP.

October 2014:

SRLF Adjusted Allocation Request

CoUL convened as SRLF Board without faculty member present and approved the reduced SRLF allocations.

January 2015:

RLF Planning and Space Issues Strategizing – E. Mitchell

UC RLFs are higher density than SFSU storage facility. Mitchell projects up to 1M duplicate items. Politically, we must leverage existing resources to justify additional building.

Storage options

- a. Reconfigure current space to hold more – adding more NRLF shelving would accommodate 50-100k volumes.
- b. UC Berkeley Regatta building – a football field size room that holds Bancroft archives plus 2 other partners. Other collections would need to be relocated for NRLF to move in.
 - Other spaces are under development at Regatta and might be a possibility for special collections.
- c. New phase for NRLF – 30-100k sf. Existing cooling/infrastructure are sufficient for an addition. Cost for construction is \$400/sf. Architect suggests a building of 100k asf which would cost \$40M with some cost reduction for the existing infrastructure.

By comparison, NRLF Phase 3 was 50-60k sf (2-3M volumes) – a building of comparable size would cost around 20M. New construction on campuses is largely funded by philanthropy. Should building meet immediate needs or a futuristic plan that might be of interest to donors? If we hold off construction for 5 years we may be better able to predict the amount of space needed for the long-term storage.

- d. Campuses independently lease space

ACTION:

CoUL members will consult locally with campus stakeholders regarding feasibility and potential cost benefits of de-duplicating the RLFs. Discussion are investigatory, and should consider options for how to reduce the possible impact on scholarship with service model improvements such as expedited delivery.

February 2015:

CoUL convened as Shared Libraries Facilities Board

SLFB endorsed “RLF space and service planning 2015-2017” proposal with amendments.

June 2015:

RLF Planning [CoUL convened as SLFB]

De-duplication Report (RLF Collection Management Proposal): Total duplicates between RLFs still fairly low at 700,000 volumes. SRLF has good workflow for de-duplication. Check persistence policy and whether it allows withdrawal of items. Proposal is to de-duplicate 20,000 volumes in the WEST collection. Report also recommends that dedicated shared print collections, which have extremely low usage rates, be moved to other off-site facility to allow more space for campus allocations.

Allocations for 2015-16: SRLF has space for approximately 96,000 VE. Does the board want to reduce allocations to Northern campuses to help stave off filling up of RLFs?

Having a space crunch demonstrates need. Maybe able to get money for building, but not for de-duping. Consider de-duping be done as proof-of-concept project. It’s an opportunity to train staff to

do work, see how much it actually costs. Allow SRLF to do the de-duping because they're not receiving as many volumes and have a workflow. Start mid-year, along with allocation reduction. 24% reduction is endorsed per the *RLF Collection Management Proposal*.
UC Berkeley one-time allocation request: approved with 2 abstentions.

July 2015:

HathiTrust print monographs

The HathiTrust Report has been well received. Libraries can make comments on the program. HT wants to form an implementation group over the summer. CoUL is in agreement and thinks UCs should participate. If so, the whole retrospective monograph question will have been decided, because it's essentially a 25-year commitment to keeping the monographs. Issues might include: duplication and treating as shared collection on a national scale, which would mean that items are open to lending to institutions nationwide. Perhaps include a statement about committing **one** copy. Should be discussed by SLFB, and information shared with local library committees and SLASIAC.

Action: Mitchell will communicate CoUL discussion to Shared Print Strategy Group. Report will then go to SLFB.

RLF Planning

Iron Mountain would like a document outlining what UC is asking for, including the specific need for more high-density storage. SLFB will need to sign off on continued conversations with Iron Mountain. Mitchell will talk to capital planning folks at Berkeley and investigate P3 funding and the requirements needed for public/private partnerships to see if it's worthwhile. He will also find out about the need for an RFP or RFI for this type of project.