

**Statewide Storage Task Force Agenda**  
**Minutes**  
**Monday, February 18, 2008**  
**10a-11:30a**  
**Conference Call**

**Members Attending:** Frank Allen(UCF), Lisandra Carmichael(UWF), Ted Chafin(FSU), Emmett Denny(FAMU), Becky Donlan(FGCU), Maris Hayashi(FAU), Beth Layton(UF-HSCL), Phyllis Ruscella(USF), Ben Walker(UF-Smathers Libraries), Robb Waltner(UNF), Rita Cauce(FIU),

**Ex-Officio/Deans Attending:** Jennifer Kuntz(FCLA)

- I. Review of minutes
  - The [January 31, 2008](#) minutes were approved.
  
- II. Review scheduling/communication
  - a. Planned schedule acceptable?
    - Yes.
  
  - b. Doodle worked okay?
    - Yes.
  
  - c. Listserv created
    - A listserv has been created. Send Michelle Newberry ([fclmin@cns.ufl.edu](mailto:fclmin@cns.ufl.edu)) contact information to join the listserv.
    - A new Statewide Storage Task Force web page is now available on the CSUL website (see <http://csul.net/storage/storage.shtml>). This will be considered the taskforce's official web page. Additional information can be added to each member's profile by selecting "Update Committee Member Info" in the upper right hand corner of the page.
  
- III. Recent reports submitted (intermediate needs if project not funded until 2010-2011)
  - a. USF – It is estimated the proposed storage facility would result in a \$20,000 savings per year with 20,000-25,000 square feet gained.
  - b. FSU – report \$650,000 for 1<sup>st</sup> year needs.
  - c. UCF – reported \$55,000-\$65,000 for 1<sup>st</sup> year needs. Quote received from Iron Mountain.
  - d. Is it okay to post these reports online?
    - Yes – Ben will try to post them today.

Has each campus been asked to provide a report? If a campus has no immediate need for off site storage do those institutions need to provide a report? Ben's understanding is that this topic was discussed at a CSUL meeting. The impression is that everyone should submit a report even if they do not have an immediate need. If an institution hasn't been asked to provide a report perhaps those institutions should check with their respective directors to be sure.

Ben is working to comprise UF's report. There has been some discussion about creating a small model shared depository (not HD) at UF on an intermediate basis if the proposed shared facility is not funding until 2010-2011.

IV. Best plan of attack for determining policy priorities

- a. Need something ready for CSUL meeting in March
  - Need at least preliminary recommendations for this meeting
- b. One solution: Pick one problem (e.g., ILL), review policies from different institutions, decide on best?
  - In trying to determine policies/priorities it would be helpful to determine what the primary purpose of the facility will be in order to focus on policies/priorities related to that purpose. It would also be helpful to start with a preliminary characterization (description/purpose) of the collection. Could start with the following questions:

1. What type of materials will be house in the facility? The reports submitted may help to reveal commonalities between institutions and provide a starting place for determining the types of materials.

Another good place to start is to state what materials each institution will move from their current storage facilities and libraries. Currently the following institutions have the below listed types of materials in storage:

- UCF – do not currently have materials in storage. Materials (bound journals w/ electronic access & bound indexes and abstracts) would be transferred out of current library to reclaim space for public seating, etc
- USF – has materials stored offsite (JSTOR, Triple E, Project Muse, university archives, unprocessed special collections, bound journals) and onsite (runs of bound journals available electronically, reference collection materials that are available electronically, special collections being cataloged)
- FSU – has 2 onsite storage facilities. All materials currently in storage will be transferred, as well as, 10-25% of the materials currently located in the library. Monographs, special collections, micro materials and maps are all possibilities for materials that will be transferred.
- FAMU – has only onsite – old reference materials, government documents now available in other formats, periodical collection resulting from medical grants, materials for academic programs that on longer exist, gift materials waiting to be processed.
- GCU – has only onsite – reference runs now available online
- FIU – some onsite – JSTOR bound journal titles, master theses
- FAU – do not currently have materials in storage. Materials (Government Documents-Florida & Federal, bound journals-science & engineering, monographs) would be transferred out of the current library.
- UF Health - do not currently have materials in storage

- UNF - do not currently have materials in storage. Materials (low use monographs, incomplete runs of periodicals no longer subscribed too) would be transferred out of the current library
- UWF - do not currently have materials in storage. Materials (bound journals, indexes & abstracts, special collections, multi media-VHS, LPs, etc in obsolete formats) would be transferred out of the current library.
- UF – entire contents of current offsite storage facility would be transferred– special collections, bulk monographs (Dewey & LC), journals, oversized maps, maps in cases, some low use film/fiches

Ben will circulate an email this week listing materials being considered for deposit, as well as, where overlaps will seem occur.

Purpose statement - to move existing storage materials into the shared storage facility. An informational item was asked to be included to express concern about volume counts. Institutions may want to be able to maintain bib records in their respective catalog for materials deposited into the storage facility.

The Generation Fifth sales representative is willing to come speak to task force members. It may be a good idea to get her here to have a face to face meeting about what the software's capabilities are. The cost of this software was figured into the original funding proposal.

## 2. How is access provided to the patron?

- Little use materials that would be assessable – i.e. scanned or delivered to a user elsewhere
- Material that will be used inside the facility
- Digitization
- How many copies are going to be allowed
- What level of cataloging do materials have to have
- How will ILL, Course Reserves be handled

### c. Other solutions?

## V. Policies

### a. Examples:

- University of Minnesota*: Open to all academic, public, and governmental libraries in Minnesota; Useful documentation, including forms (<http://www.minitex.umn.edu/mlac/deposit/overview.aspx>)
- ReCAP*: joint facility for Princeton, Columbia University, and NYPL (<http://recap1.princeton.edu/about/processing.html>)
- Orbis-Cascade*: Comprehensive list of policies: Open to a mixture of universities, colleges, and community colleges in Washington and Oregon ([http://www.orbiscascade.org/staffhome/RLSC-Operations\\_Policies\\_05-11.htm](http://www.orbiscascade.org/staffhome/RLSC-Operations_Policies_05-11.htm))

- iv. Five College Library Depository: Good descriptions of ILL/Reserves policies, as well as background on the model used; open to (<http://www.fivecolleges.edu/sites/depository/policies/>)
- v. OCLC Library Storage Facility Report – Task force members are encouraged to review this report. Page 12 lists all of the Harvard Model facilities in the United States. Page 16 contains an environmental scan of what these types of facilities look like, what they typically house and their respective policies. (<http://csul.net/storage/storage.shtml>)

VI. Wrap-up, scheduling

- The next meeting is scheduled for March 3, 10a-11:30a.