

SLFB Action Plan for Managing Deposits as a System

June 2024

This document is the deliverable for SLFB FY23-24 Priority 2.iii: [Co-develop an action plan, including policy, service and operational changes, including short and medium-term planning for and changes to annual allocations and how deposits are managed for the system.](#)

SRLF is already at capacity for oversized material (books over 9” by 12”) and is projected to reach capacity for books up to 9” by 12” in approximately 2 years. To extend SRLF’s ability to continue accepting deposits of that size beyond the summer of 2026, we have proposed several space reclamation projects for SLFB to approve. Depending on which projects are endorsed and implemented, SRLF believes capacity could be extended by an additional 3, and possibly more, years. That reality and the UC Libraries’ intention to move toward a systemwide strategic allocation requires planning changes to policies, services, and operations for the RLFs as a whole.

Action plan objectives:

- Maximize existing RLF physical capacity
- Create the framework to support strategic and equitable deposit opportunities for UC campuses

Potential solutions:

Policy changes

Work Item	Objectives	Recommended Action(s)	Stakeholders	Resources Needed
Expanded, systemwide guidelines for how to prioritize deposits to the RLFs	Maximize existing RLF physical capacity	SLFB charges a task force of the Shared Collections Leadership Group SCLG and Shared Print Strategy Team SPST to propose the guidelines (refining but not limiting to previous work of SPCMS on collection management decisions (i.e what materials and collections are strategic to send to RLFs).	Task Force (SCLG/SPST - Responsible SCLG - Consulted SPST - Consulted DOC - Informed SLFB - Accountable	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Guardrails from SLFB• Project management• In-kind contribution from Task Force members• SLFB endorsement• 6 month timeline from initiation to completion

Policy and method for defining allocation	Strategic deposit opportunities, sustainability of RLF operations	<p>SLFB holds a Framing Discussion comes to Conceptual Agreement on defining what a strategic allocation model looks like.</p> <p>SLFB charges existing groups or a new group to draft the guidelines.</p> <p>Includes consideration of future service expectations as SRLF becomes an access facility e.g. cross region deposit).</p>	TBD Group- Responsible SLFB - Accountable CoUL - Consulted SCLG - Consulted SPST - Consulted HOSC - Consulted DOC - Informed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Framing input from SLFB ● UL chair ● Project management ● SLFB endorsement ● 12 month timeline from initiation to completion
---	---	--	--	--

Service & operational changes

Please note: Service and operational changes at SRLF need to be determined and approved before NRLF service and operations changes can be determined.

Work Item	Objectives	Recommended Action(s)	Stakeholders	Resources needed
Reconfigure SRLF collections to reclaim physical space*	Maximize remaining RLF space	<p>Implement -</p> <p>1. Dedup project of approximately 90K bibs (dups within SRLF). Work would be done over 3-4 years from start date.</p>	<p>1. SRLF - Responsible SCLG - Consulted SPST - Informed DOC - Informed SLFB - Accountable</p>	<p>1. In-kind FTE; potential PT student cost.</p> <p>Labor estimates for this project would be 10-15% FTE time (Tin Tran) and 5000 student hours in total.</p> <p>Work for generating dup bib IDs is already finished.</p> <p>Most of the physical work is done by student workers.</p>

		<p>2. Dedup approximately 70K items of Shared Print (JACS/WEST that are duplicative to NRLF.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Duplicates to NRLF's JACS, Silver and Gold, and - Contributions to NRLF's JACS, Silver and Gold gaps - If NRLF expands participation in SP in the future, this could lead to more deduplication at 	<p>2. SRLF - Responsible NRLF - Consulted SCLG - Consulted SPST - Consulted SPOT - Consulted DOC - Informed SLFB - Accountable</p>	<p>Estimating the amount of time per week is challenging because of size matching for replacements. For the Processors, the work to be done will be part of routine processing. No regular work will be put on hold. Remaining complexity is syncing records with Caia. Material costs for new barcodes and dumpster/recycling service.</p> <p>2. In-kind FTE, both RLFs; potential PT student cost; existing JACS shipping capacity with possible augmentation of that service at ~\$1.00 per item.</p> <p>Labor estimate for this project would be 10-15% FTE time (Tin Tran) and 4000 student hours in total. NRLF labor if SRLF contributes JACS, Silver, and Gold to fill gaps in NRLF runs.</p>
--	--	---	--	--

		<p>SRLF (freeing up more space)</p> <p>3. Deaccession NAPA VHS tapes to reclaim space and repurpose shelving/space for other materials. Cabinets currently are an entire east wall of a floor of SRLF (est. 1 year worth of normal sized deposits, if cabinets are replaced by shelving)</p>	<p>3. SRLF - Responsible FATA - Consulted SLFB - Consulted UCLA UL - Accountable Management Council - Informed Collections Council - Informed</p>	<p>SRLF labor for Tin Tran, the Processing Manager, generating reports and record editing, and student labor to pull material to send to NRLF and/or discard. Shipping cost for material transport to NRLF explore leveraging the Iron Mountain JACS contract). This is a possible area for beta testing if SRLF can assist by processing material directly into NRLF IZ.</p> <p>3. In-kind FTE commitment. Requires identification of owners of the tapes, and permission to deaccession. Determination of weight-bearing capabilities/limitations for the space to support proposed space usage (currently large cabinets that store VHS). As far as we are aware, these tapes have no online records, so there would be minimal/no database work.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Assess - Feasibility of digitizing and withdrawing newspaper collections at SRLF. This would lead to more space for special collections. This is about 1-2 years of Special Collections materials deposit. SRLF could also reconfigure to maximize space usage.</p> <p>Long-range - Assess feasibility of putting previously shelved material in trays to reclaim/maximize shelf space. Could be done along with a deduplication project. Would reclaim a minimum of 7% and as much as 14% with a more extensive reorganization of materials. As deposits wind down, work could be done by</p>	<p>SRLF - Responsible Local owning unit(s) - Consulted UCLA UL - Accountable Collections Council - Informed Management Council - Informed SLFB - Informed</p> <p>SRLF - Accountable/Responsible</p>	<p>Funding for contract staff and actual work to be done. This would be the most costly effort, involving UCLA Lib. Preservation, SRLF, Digitization and Collection managers from East Asian and International Studies groups. This would likely require either limited appointment or 2-year contract employees devoted primarily to this project in terms of digitization. SRLF IS currently only has 2 LA3s (down from 5 FTE a few years ago).</p> <p>In-kind FTE, for proof of concept and to be deployed as routine work when SRLF is at capacity. Project management Funding for trays/materials and additional laptops for the stacks Funding to stay on Caia/IMS (this would be necessary) Could be done by</p>
--	--	---	---	--

		current staff/students.		existing staff/students when SRLF is no longer accepting deposits. Otherwise, funding for contract or limited appointment staff. Potentially a complicated and labor intensive process. May require staging space. Recommend a pilot program to formally assess feasibility.
--	--	-------------------------	--	--

**There is ongoing concern that the benefit of deduplication will not outweigh the cost. A new empirical study from ReCAP and WRLC contrasts the construction cost/book as \$5-\$6, and the cost per book deaccessioned as ~\$0.30. Though the RLF deaccession process would likely differ significantly from ReCAP's due to the legacy shelving model, their data seems to suggest their approach as significantly less costly per book, compared with constructing a new stacks building. Based on this new information, the SLFB 2iii Subgroup is proposing several deduplication projects in the work plan. Presentation slides:*

https://www.crl.edu/sites/default/files/event_materials/6_Krebeck_Bogus_Deaccessions%20as%20a%20Service.pdf

Sources and reports consulted:

- [Timeline for major decision points](#)
- [SLFB shared principles for considering service pathways](#)