1) **Introductions, Review of Agenda & Outcomes for the Day**
Lougee welcomed those attending the session and outlined work that has been done since the Advisory Board met in February. Minutes of the Feb. 23 meeting were reviewed and approved with the amendment that the date should read Feb. 23, 2011, not 2010.

2) **Review of the draft, “Operating Principles & Guidelines” and “Memorandum of Agreement”**
Advisory Board members discussed responses received following the circulation of draft documents. Members agreed that the Operating Principles and Guidelines should be written at a general level, not dealing with specifics of management issues. Questions discussed included whether:

- The 25-year retention period was a reasonable time expectation. The Board agreed that it was.
- The current restriction should be continued against circulation of full journal volumes beyond the MLAC waiting room with the exception being that they may be circulated back to the depositing library. MLAC staff indicated that this procedure has worked well to this point. The Board agreed that the policy should continue unchanged but noted that new questions could be considered at a later date.
- Attention should be given now to development of a collection profile for MLAC materials. The Board agreed that current policies make an active effort to develop a collection profile unnecessary.

Homan made the motion, seconded by Roca, that the “Operating Principles & Guidelines” and “Memorandum of Agreement” be approved. Motion was approved.

3) **Briefing on pilot project: review of UMN Health Science Libraries and Mayo Libraries holdings in MLAC context.**
Watson briefed the Board on a pilot project undertaken by the University of Minnesota’s Health Science Libraries in consultation with the Mayo Clinic Libraries, which will allow HSL to take part in various initiatives while:

- freeing up space on shelves at BioMedical library and MLAC.
- enabling decision-makers to make national and regional commitments for print retention.
- taking steps needed to analyze this subset of holdings that can inform later University Libraries and MLAC decisions and actions.

Watson explained that the pilot project grew, in part, from an effort by the National Library of Medicine to determine the availability in print and electronic form of a core group of 250 clinical journals. She discussed information gained through study of holdings among HSL, Mayo Clinic, and University of Minnesota, Duluth, serials collections. These collections, plus medical holdings by other Minnesota libraries, mean that the state has very strong health science-related holdings.

Watson and DeJohn charged a working group to undertake the study. The group made important progress in areas including studying overlap among the collections and identifying questions like binding that impact the useability of print materials and factors bearing upon number of print copies that would be required to meet usage needs.

Lougee told the Board that the University Libraries have begun to store serials in newly leased space in the University’s Printing Services building on Como Avenue. Possible use of some of that facility for storage of MLAC materials is under consideration.

**4) Update on environment (storage projects and related initiatives in other states)**

Lougee and Demas reported on recent developments concerning storage projects and initiatives ongoing around the country. Lougee noted that seven of the Big Ten libraries having committed to helping to fund a shared storage facility at Indiana University, which will be dedicated to storage of STEM journals.

Demas provided updates on projects including the Western Regional Storage Trust (WEST), Consortium of Academic and Research Libraries in Illinois (CARLI), and Orbis Cascade. All the projects are considering how many print copies need to be retained to meet program participants’ needs.

Lougee spoke about the development of the HathiTrust and current activities, including the Constitutional Convention, which is to meet in October to discuss goals, policies, and future directions for the collaborative. Discussion is expected on topics including governance, priority setting, the shared storage facility, and other topics. She also reported on the current status of the Google Book Settlement, HathiTrust’s work dealing with identification of copyright holders for orphan works, and a new suit by the Authors Guild and other groups concerning orphan works.

OCLC’s plan to facilitate sharing of information about preservation and storage information through the use of the MARC 21 583 field was discussed as was consideration currently being given to getting a new OCLC symbol for use for depositing libraries’ materials stored in MLAC. The goal of a new symbol would be to make MLAC materials more identifiable and facilitate information sharing.

Demas reported on results of the survey he administered last spring that asked Minnesota academic and public libraries about their collections and their interest in MLAC, storage and/or weeding of collection materials, the possibility of additional MLAC services, digital preservation, fee-based services for MLAC, and other topics. He noted that respondents had indicated interest in learning more about these topics.

**5) Future Planning for MLAC**

The Board agreed that a major goal for the next year should be outreach and education to help the Minnesota library community learn more about MLAC and its services as well as about its potential role as part of the national print storage facility initiative. Questions discussed included:
What would be needed to make the MLAC collection more identifiable as a separate entity?
Should there be exploration of a common catalog/virtual library status for MLAC?
What would be the ramifications of wider emphasis on MLAC as a separate entity?
Do depositing libraries see MLAC as part of their collection management strategy?
Should the Board establish a small steering committee to give feedback to Minitex staff as policy and operating questions are considered? (DeJohn and Lougee noted that future plans call for more frequent meetings of the full MLAC Advisory Board – semiannual meetings are being considered.)
Would staff of Minnesota libraries be interested in webinars, seminars, and other educational opportunities about MLAC, digital preservation, the information gained from Demas’ environmental scan, and other topics?
Would selection of a new name for MLAC help gain the facility wider recognition and increase understanding of its mission and services?
Would the availability of additional storage space to allow more deposits into MLAC increase the interest of the Minnesota library community in MLAC?

The Board reviewed the “next steps” suggested in Demas’ 2011 report and agreed that they helped provide a framework for going forward. Among next steps cited for future work were:
- Make approved changes to Operating Principles & Guidelines and Memorandum of Agreement, distribute to directors of depositing libraries for signature, and return to Minitex.
- Develop and implement a strategic plan
- Explore applications for grant funding for data collection and other aspects of work to explore deduping the MLAC collection
- Explore the use of work teams on various MLAC topics
- Move forward with activities related to the Health Science Library Print Retention Plan, including consolidating and coordinating holdings between MLAC and the University Libraries Health Science Libraries and gaining experience in deduping.
- Define data needs to inform decision-making
- Continue the environmental scan work to monitor key developments nationally
- Pursue partnerships by joining CRL’s Shared Print Archiving Registry and considering how best to position MLAC and define its role

6) Adjourn