

Library space planning: Collaborative long-term storage of print materials



CAVAL recently completed the second stage of the CARM (CAVAL Archival and Research Material) Centre. This second stage has the capacity of 62 linear kilometres of library-like storage for a capital cost of \$AUD14 million. As part of the planning process, CAVAL undertook an analysis of alternative storage options (for low-use material) from the perspective of potential users (i.e. universities) to assess the financial and non-financial impacts associated with the options. This analysis assumes a total of 586,000 volumes requiring off-site storage over a 10-year period.

Summary of the Storage Options Analysis

Options	Description	Financial Impact (total cost in Nominal Terms over a 10 year forecast)	Financial Impact (total cost in NPV over a 10 year forecast)	Overall Qualitative Impact	Risk Rating
		\$000's	\$000's		
1	Base Case – Do nothing and continue to acquire materials	\$1,119	\$641	Poor	Very High
2	CARM 2 (Partial Capital Contribution)	\$6,297	\$4,709	Excellent	Low
3	CARM 2 (No Capital Contribution)	\$8,227	\$4,933	Excellent	Low
4	Build new library building on campus	\$9,628	\$10,081	Good	Moderate
5	Digitise collections	\$58,116	\$39,480	Excellent	Moderate – High
6	Retro-fit on campus library buildings for medium to high density storage	\$4,948	\$4,050	Good	Moderate
7	Re-fit existing off site university owned building for medium to high density storage	\$8,417	\$6,206	Good	Moderate – High
8	Purpose build off-site medium or high density storage facility	\$5,233	\$5,315	Good	Moderate – High
9	Contract for storage with commercial provider	\$3,066	\$1,856	Poor	Very High

Conclusions

- The CARM 2 option is a competitive option for the storage of low-use research materials because:
 - a lower initial capital outlay is required compared to the purpose built options, and no additional library resources to monitor and catalogue research materials are needed;
 - the facility provides the qualitative needs for a user of a low-use storage facility; and
 - set-up and operational costs to the user minimised.
- The purpose built and re-fit options are less attractive due to:
 - the relatively high cost of developing or refurbishing a purpose built facility for the sole use of a single University;
 - the need to source resources to process, catalogue and monitor low-use research materials by the Universities;
 - the opportunity costs associated with developing on campus; and
 - the risks to the Universities associated with the development period may be too high given the purpose of the facility is not a core tertiary service, but rather a key requirement of tertiary libraries.
- While the digitisation option is a costly resource intensive process, future unidentified cost savings and additional services offered in a digital environment may make this option attractive. However the impact of permanent loss of print research volumes would also need to be identified.

Contact

Cathie Jilovsky
cathie.jilovsky@caval.edu.au
0407 755 490

Janette Wright
janette.wright@caval.edu.au
0414 473 358