

The Archivist's Advisory Committee on the Presidential Library-Foundation Partnerships

November 29, 2012

Advisory Committee Members in Attendance and At The Meeting Table

Charlie Becker – Herbert Hoover Presidential Library Association
Alex Burden – Harry S. Truman Library Institute
Stewart Etherington – Eisenhower Foundation
Tom McNaught – John F. Kennedy Library Foundation
Larry Temple – Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation
Joe Calvaruso – Gerald R. Ford Presidential Foundation
Bruce Lindsey – William J. Clinton Foundation

Alternate Committee Members in Attendance and At The Meeting Table

Chuck Muckenfuss for Felicia Wong – Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt Institute
Sandy Quinn for Ron Walker – Richard Nixon Foundation
Terry Anderson for Chip Carter – The Carter Center
Glenn Baker for Fred Ryan – Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Foundation
Fred McClure for James Cicconi – George Bush Presidential Library Foundation
Brian Cossiboom for Mark Langdale – George W. Bush Foundation

Foundation Association Members in Attendance and At The Meeting Table

Stephanie Streett – William J. Clinton Foundation

NARA Staff in Attendance and At The Meeting Table

David Ferriero – Archivist of the United States
Debra Wall – Deputy Archivist of the United States
Jim Gardner – Legislative Archives, Presidential Libraries and Museum Services
Donna Garland – Chief Strategy and Communication Officer
Micah Cheatham – Chief Financial Officer
Tom Mills – Chief Operations Officer
Chris Runkle – General Counsel
Gary M. Stern – General Counsel
Susan Donius – Office of Presidential Libraries
Nancy Smith – Presidential Materials Division
Tom Schwartz – Herbert Hoover Presidential Library and Museum
Lynn Bassanese – Franklin D. Roosevelt Presidential Library and Museum
Mike Devine – Harry S. Truman Presidential Library and Museum
Karl Weissenbach – Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library and Museum
Tom Putnam – John F. Kennedy Presidential Library and Museum
Mark Updegrave – Lyndon Baines Johnson Presidential Library and Museum

Paul Wormer – Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum
Elaine Didier – Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library and Museum
Jay Hakes – Jimmy Carter Presidential Library and Museum
Duke Blackwood – Ronald Reagan Presidential Library and Museum
Warren Finch – George Bush Presidential Library and Museum
Terri Garner – William J. Clinton Presidential Library and Museum
Alan Lowe – Geogre W. Bush Presidential Library and Museum

Welcome (David Ferriero)

Mr. Ferriero (Archivist of the United States) welcomed the group to another meeting of the Advisory Committee. While distributing facsimiles of an Annie Oakley letter and the check used to purchase Alaska to the group he asked the Committee Members, Presidential Library Directors, and representatives of the respective Presidential Library Foundations to introduce themselves.

Jim Gardner (Executive for Legislative Archives, Presidential Libraries, and Museum Services (LPM)) announced the retirement of Nancy Smith as the Director of the Presidential Materials Division. He then introduced John Laster as the new Director of Presidential Materials Division.

Mr. Ferriero noted that when considering NARA's role in a Presidential transition he panicked at the thought of an untimely transition without Nancy Smith, so he asked her to stay through the election. He thanked her for staying and wished her well in retirement.

Presidential Library Sustainability Working Group (Ferriero and Gardner)

Mr. Ferriero introduced the topic by providing context for NARA's effort to examine how to keep NARA's Presidential Library system sustainable. He referred to the previous alternative models for Presidential Libraries report written for Congress, noting that even with the change in the leadership of the House of Representatives since that report was written he expects hearings on the future of Presidential Libraries in next year. He wants to be prepared, based on data, to be able to talk about the future of Presidential Libraries when he is asked to do so. Mr. Ferriero concluded his introduction by observing this effort is also part of NARA's attempt to look at all aspects of its budget, not an isolated effort directed at Presidential Libraries.

Mr. Gardner distributed updated copies of the working group's charter (including the group's membership and the timeline for the project) to supplement the handout provided in advance of the meeting. He said the purpose of the working group is to assess the Presidential Library system to provide the Archivist with a model for the future he can use with Congress and other external parties. He added the group will look at the costs and benefits of existing and future libraries, i.e., how the system can accommodate future libraries. Beyond costs, the group will work to get a clear picture of the priorities and differences within the system (programs,

stakeholders, financial resources, communities, etc.). Mr. Gardner said the working group has also been tasked to examine how we measure success, both in terms of quantity (data) and quality. What does data tell us about individual libraries and the system of Presidential Libraries? He noted that Library Directors and Susan Donius (Director of the Office of Presidential Libraries) have been working on aspects of this already, so this working group will build from the existing analysis. He said the working group will also look at the costs of operating the Libraries and who pays for what (a question he deemed critical for the future) – among Operating Expense (OE) funds, the Trust Fund, Foundations, and external fundraising, where are the resources coming from and what is the potential for future resources. Mr. Gardner added the group will look at other NARA units to see costs/benefits for similar programs. He said the scope of the group’s work also includes external institutions, but how this will work within the analysis has not yet been determined. He mentioned Donna Garland’s (Chief Strategy and Communications Officer) upcoming presentation to the Advisory Committee on benchmarking as part of NARA’s strategic planning process, adding that this same process can feed into the working group’s efforts to better understand standards and expectations. The working group will analyze potential costs savings for the system. Mr. Gardner observed NARA is unlikely to see an increase in funding any time soon, so we need more thought on how to sustain current and future Presidential Libraries. He concluded by noting the ultimate goal of the working group is to use all the data to plan for the future. The group’s report will be more than a compilation of numbers and charts, it will help the agency understand what all the information means and what it means for the future of Presidential Libraries.

Mr. Ferrerio emphasized this effort is a planning tool. NARA will be planning for a new Presidential Library in next four years, so we need to work intelligently with the White House. The Presidential records transferred to NARA are increasingly in electronic form, so this should be factored in the planning of the new Presidential Library. He said the process for the work of this group has not been finalized, and that he wants the group to establish check-in points with Foundations so all are plugged in to the process. Mr. Ferrerio announced he would like the Foundations to undertake a similar exercise to talk about the future of Presidential Libraries – to think about their value to their local communities and the nation; think about costs for maintenance and support; etc. In short, he said, he wants to really get advice from this Advisory Committee.

Tom McNaught (of the John F. Kennedy Library Foundation) commented that the Foundations understand there is no single model for Presidential Libraries and Foundations – some Foundations own their own property, other foundations operate within NARA facilities under more strict rules. He remarked that to ask them to go forward with this presents a big challenge. The Advisory Committee meetings are helpful, but participating in the meetings has led to the realization that the Kennedy Library Foundation is not like other Foundations. With that said he does not know how this exercise will work for us. Mr. Gardner asked if there is a better way to get Foundations’ input? Tom Putnam (Director of the John F. Kennedy Library) replied that the

challenge given the NARA working group is both the present and future of Presidential Libraries, but maybe the Foundations could look at Obama forward to suggest a future model for the system. Mr. Ferriero responded the Foundations could also identify best practices for what works.

Joseph Calvaruso (of the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Foundation) said half of the museum stores in the system are run by NARA, the rest by Foundations. He added that the group needs to determine who is best suited to run gift shops. He suggested the Foundations look to small issues like this that can be rolled up to a new model going forward. With that in place the older Foundations can determine if/how to change their operations to the new model.

Alex Burden (of the Harry S. Truman Library Institute) asked Mr. Ferriero for guidance on what he wants their opinion on, in order to give them a framework. Mr. Ferriero replied if the Foundations choose to focus on the future based on best practices they you will have opportunities during check-ins to offer input on other aspects of the analysis.

Elaine Didier (Director of the Gerald R. Ford Library) said asking the Foundations to focus on the future makes sense. Foundations do not have the same access to data, so asking them to think more globally allows them to provide advice on how to proceed going forward.

ACTION ITEM 1: The Archivist wants follow up conversation on this topic at the next Advisory Committee meeting. NARA will give the Foundations the final charter and a charge with requested areas of focus. The Foundations will report to on what they propose to do in support of this analysis as well as with any questions they have on the project.

Benchmarking for NARA's Strategic Plan (Garland)

Mr. Ferriero introduced the presentation by noting one of his favorite aspects of the emerging agency culture in NARA is to look outside ourselves at other institutions to establish a culture of benchmarking. He said Donna Garland would report on what NARA has learned so far from its benchmarking.

Ms. Garland began her presentation with an observation that as NARA places more focus on benchmarking the American Productivity and Quality Center has confirmed the agency is on the right path to take advantage of benchmarking.

She updated the group on NARA's strategic planning process. NARA is currently between the stages of setting the context and developing the strategy. The strategic planning effort has looked externally and internally to analyze the agency's environment in starting to craft the strategy. She will meet with NARA's Management Team in the next month to develop vision and mission statements as well as the high level strategy.

She described “access” as the primary Line of Business for NARA, noting that a focus on access requires us to ask customers how they want access to our materials. We should be where the public is, not just where we want them to be. She described the three Sub-Lines of Business identified by NARA – 1) access to traditional records and artifacts, 2) access to electronic records (both born-digital and digitized), and 3) “Web-X” (software, crowd-sourcing, Flickr, etc. – i.e., what does evolving technology mean for the National Archives?).

Ms. Garland said the emphasis on NARA’s benchmarking is to look beyond our traditional competitors to ask what products and services should we be looking at and what organizations do it best? She added that her team is creating a standard operating procedure (SOP) for benchmarking in NARA. In briefly reviewing the institutions benchmarked so far (Glenbow Museum, Abraham Lincoln Presidential Library and Museum, Walmart, Carfax, Library of National Intelligence, Center for the Future of Museums, MLB Network, MIT Media Lab, etc.) she said the team has learned a variety of lessons (saving utility costs through facility standard changes, innovative tools for archival management through reappraisal and deaccessioning, alternatives to traditional museums using gamification, etc.).

Mr. Ferriero observed that a surprising factor in the benchmarking so far is the high level of interest in NARA from all the places the benchmarking teams have visited, a reaction that is allowing NARA to build relationships with these organizations who also want to learn about us. Garland added NARA staff have been greatly interested in benchmarking as well. Mr. Ferriero asked the group for their experiences in benchmarking as well as places they can point to for future benchmarking analysis. Nancy Smith suggested that with the explosive growth in the volume of electronic records coming to NARA’s new Presidential Libraries the agency should consider benchmarking with the Chief Information Officer of the White House Office of Administration. Mark Updegrove (Director of the Lyndon B. Johnson Presidential Library) said he would love to see more information on NARA’s customer satisfaction. With a comprehensive view of how all our customers see our services we could aim to improve on those numbers every year in every aspect of our operations. The group discussed the lack of a comprehensive approach in the Libraries to exit surveys or other customer satisfaction tools while some Foundations do gather customer feedback. Garland commented she needs to hear what’s been done with Foundations and how to proceed with OMB. Mr. Gardner said an important aspect to this is to try to gather as much information as we can on people who choose not to participate in NARA’s exhibits and programs. Ms. Garland replied that she worked on surveys of a similar type during her time at Hallmark. Stephanie Streett (of the William J. Clinton Foundation) commented that the Clinton Foundation is working with the American Association for State and Local History (AASLH) survey instrument for their education programs. Mr. Gardner said they use the same survey in the DC-area programs as well.

Ms. Didier asked if the benchmarking notes can be shared. Ms. Garland answered her staff is working on how to distribute the results of the benchmarking visits. Mr. Ferriero added that no one has seen the benchmarking reports yet, so the group has not been left out of the distribution.

Ms. Didier replied that the Presidential Libraries may be able to implement changes based on lessons learned from benchmarking, so she would love to get the results soon. Ms. Garland said once her staff has finalized the benchmarking SOP she will work with Susan Donius to get the SOPs out to the Libraries in the spring so they can do their own benchmarking. She added that if the Libraries have critical areas that should be benchmarked to let her know.

ACTION ITEM 2: The Office of Presidential Libraries will distribute the SOP developed by the Strategy and Communications Office to the Presidential Libraries once that SOP is available.

Fred McClure (of the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation) asked for an expanded description of the “Web-X” line of business. Ms. Garland said this represents the robust level of activity in cyberspace, i.e., people gathering and consuming information and how it might be relevant to NARA. The question for NARA is how do we feed into the space? One early example of NARA’s work in this area is the Citizen Archivist Dashboard, a portal for crowd-sourced tagging, transcription of digitized documents, etc. Mr. McClure asked how does the broader distribution of public records in the online environment affect NARA – in other words, how much impact is made to NARA by a blogger posting a document as part of a policy debate? Garland responded that if a government official has a “tweet-up” information created through that activity may become record; if a private citizen does it alone it does not affect us. Debra Wall (Deputy Archivist of the United States) said the model NARA is using with the Citizen Archivist Dashboard and other online communities is that the agency puts its materials online for the public to tag records, link to other records – in other words, create a whole-new body of knowledge. Mr. Ferriero added the Wikipedia community is very interested in NARA’s work, as they use our documents, photos, and videos to explain aspects of US history. Where a document featured in NARA’s Today’s Document is viewed tens of thousands of times a day, posting a document to Wikipedia results in its being viewed millions of times. Mr. Gardner commented that the Center for Legislative Archives is conducting a web harvest of the web pages of Members of Congress. These have not traditionally been considered records, but this is an example of NARA’s efforts to find new ways of documenting how public figures interact. Garland commented that another key point in this is how to capture records from these activities. Ms. Didier mentioned the Ford Museum’s work to post high-resolution images of artifacts in Wikimedia Commons and to have a Wikipedian in Residence at the Ford Library. The Ford staff has already seen its content used in articles in Japan and elsewhere. While this project is new Ms. Didier said it is exciting in its potential.

Mr. Burden said that at the next Advisory Committee meeting it would be good to hear more about what NARA is learning from benchmarking. Ms. Garland responded she will be happy to do so, and will share benchmarking information in the mean time. Mr. Ferriero asked the group to share benchmarking ideas with NARA.

ACTION ITEM 3: NARA will provide an update on its benchmarking analysis at the next Advisory Committee meeting and will share information on the benchmarking effort in the mean

time. In addition, the members of the Advisory Committee will share their ideas for benchmarking candidates with NARA.

Mr. Calvaruso commented that NARA needs to come to grips with what materials NARA needs to maintain permanently. In the modern era of the Presidency people realize if they give something to the President it will go to the National Archives. Does every T-shirt gift come to NARA? Mr. Ferriero and Ms. Donius both responded not anymore. Mr. Calvaruso continued that it is no longer practical for NARA to preserve everything that comes into the Presidential office, otherwise where is the end of what you are taking on as a responsibility? Mr. Gardner responded that one of the responsibilities of the Presidential Materials Division is to narrow the scope of what comes in from the White House through active consideration of what we are collecting. Nancy Smith added NARA has several approved bulk disposal requests in place to limit the amount of public mail and other low-level materials that come into NARA's custody. In addition, NARA has tightened up the idea of what it takes in as far as artifacts. The key issue, however, is that the Presidential Records Act, passed in response to Nixon records issues in the 1970s, is a records preservation act. If a person sends an email to the White House, for instance, it is preserved unless the White House asks the Archivist for his view on whether it can be disposed or not. Mr. Calvaruso replied that this is the crux of the problem – this is a legislative problem if you have responsibilities but not the budget to fulfill the responsibilities. Micah Cheatham (NARA's Chief Financial Officer) said the Glenbow Museum was targeted for benchmarking because of the institution's robust deaccessioning program. Mr. Cheatham added his goal for the Presidential Library working group is to determine the best means for outsourcing operations and maintenance services. Mr. Gardner said we can circulate an article from the Glenbow Museum on their deaccession process. The process was not without its controversy, but NARA's goal in benchmarking is to pick places pushing boundaries. Garland agreed, saying we have tough decisions to make, so we should learn from others who have already made tough decisions.

ACTION ITEM 4: NARA will provide a copy of the Glenbow Museum article on the institution's deaccession process.

Update on the 2013 and 2014 budget, and sequestration (Cheatham)

Mr. Cheatham described the potential impact of sequestration with a chart of NARA's Funds and the impact of sequestration cuts on each (presentation slides provided separately). The largest reduction of would be \$30.6 million from NARA's OE funds, with a total reduction to all funds of \$32.2 million. He noted the reduction to the Trust Fund are strictly to administrative funds. Mr. Cheatham illustrated the trend in appropriations from FY 2009 to FY 2013 and the potential impact of sequestration to the FY 2013 budget. He noted NARA is still working on its contingency plan (Step 1 - go through FY 2012 budget execution and make cuts, Step 2 -

[currently underway] ask NARA offices to go through large contracts where cuts need to be made [service level reductions but look to avoid huge negative impact], Step 3 - review smaller expenditures to find remaining areas to reduce spending). A general request was made for the reduction numbers specific to Presidential Libraries. Gardner said he is still looking at LPM numbers and has not finalized the proposed reductions yet. Cheatham said he can provide the funding trend specific to Presidential Libraries.

ACTION ITEM 5: NARA provide funding trend for Presidential Libraries from FY 2009 – FY 2012.

Mack Teasley (of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Foundation) asked if the budget cuts would be equal across the board? Mr. Cheatham said they would not be equal. Mr. Gardner added the agency is looking at what units need rather than taking a simple allocation, and that this exercise will identify contracts and other costs that can be reduced for sequestration. Bruce Lindsey (of the Clinton Foundation) asked if NARA is spending at the \$387 million level so far this year? Cheatham replied that NARA is complying with OMB guidance to spend full allocation. Lindsey observed that if NARA has to have a 8.2% to cut from rest of year that the actual reduction will be more than 8% because the agency has spent at the previous year's level so far. Mr. Cheatham said the impact of sequestration is not immediate, as the \$32 million would be reduced from funds available from January 2nd through end of September. It would result in a difficult impact, but the reductions would be realized over the course of the nine months.

Glenn Baker (of the Ronald Reagan Presidential Foundation) asked how much is NARA's financial picture informing the strategic process? The trend line for funds is clear. Mr. Cheatham said there's an overall big push for increased efficiency in the agency. Sequestration is a threat, but it is only one aspect of the continuous effort to analyze efficiency against funds expended. Mr. Gardner commented that the Presidential Library sustainability working group has to account for the downward trend in funds while adding Presidential Libraries. Ms. Garland added that NARA's funding outlook critical to strategic planning process – high-level goals are fine, but aligning resources is critical. Mr. Cheatham commented that inherent in aligning resources is determining what you're not going to fund. Mr. Calvaruso said Presidential Libraries remain a small part of NARA – is the sustainability analysis agency-wide? Mr. Ferriero answered yes, while there are no other sustainability working groups, there have been reviews of Research Services and Information Services that are resulting in changes, like fewer research hours provided by Research Services. Mr. Cheatham added that the sustainability working group for Presidential Libraries reflects the fact that the Libraries have a distinct statutory framework. As a result, the working group is an opportunity, not a burden. Other managers don't have this opportunity in NARA.

Larry Temple (of the Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation) asked if Mr. Cheatham has a mark in mind for what to cut from the Presidential Library budgets in totality and, if so, is the cut uniform across the Libraries. Mr. Cheatham answered there are no specific targets. For

sequestration planning the reductions that cannot otherwise be found will have to come from personnel, and we want to avoid that. For the longer term, there is still no uniform targets. With respect for the fact that the Libraries have different relationships with their support organizations, different locations, etc. we do not have to force same-ness where it does not work. Mr. Temple commented that in the last hearings on Presidential Libraries a Member of Congress said funding can be reduced for Libraries because foundations will pick up the slack. He told John Mica (R-FL) that would not happen. The foundations feel it is the responsibility of the Federal government to maintain basic operations of the Libraries, while the foundations enhance their operation. There is no appetite in foundations to take on the support of basic operations. Gardner commented this is why we need foundation input in sustainability, because we cannot make assumptions antithetical to foundation goals.

Mr. Lindsey asked if LPM has an assigned target in sequestration cuts. Mr. Cheatham said no. Lindsey asked if NARA will assign reduction targets if the overall reduction goal is not met. Mr. Cheatham replied no, because NARA is using a corporate approach to find comprehensive and consistent customer service across all segments. In the ideal situation, the agency would identify more than \$32 million in savings and would choose from among them. Fred McClure observed there is a good chance NARA will have to cut less than 8.2%, so this exercise should serve the agency in good stead.

In an update on the FY 2014 budget Mr. Cheatham reported NARA has submitted its request to OMB. OMB guidance required NARA to reduce its request by \$14 million over its FY 2013 request (\$373 million). OMB did allow add-backs, so NARA has initiatives that take the total request \$6 million higher. He noted the request will be made public when transmitted to Congress in February, adding that NARA submitted requests for \$373 million and \$393 million per OMB's guidance. Mr. Teasley asked if OMB's position is that the funding for a new Presidential Library come from existing funds. Mr. Cheatham responded that it is not clear NARA will have additional costs with the addition of the George W. Bush Library's permanent facility. OMB has provided means for supplemental funds if those funds are needed for potential transitions. Ms. Wall added NARA does not get equal amounts of money for new Presidential Libraries. As a result, Presidential Libraries take a bigger and bigger piece of NARA's budget over time, so this is the sustainability issue.

Overview of the Office of Innovation (Wall)

Mr. Ferriero introduced the overview with the declaration that NARA is looking for ways to do our business in smarter ways. Centers for innovation are being set up across the Federal government, and now NARA has one as well.

Ms. Wall said NARA's leadership asked staff early in the transformation for a set of values for the agency. The three values that came from this are Collaborate, Innovate, and Learn. We have

made progress in the area of collaboration, so it is a good time to begin to more formally nurture a culture of innovation. Ms. Wall noted there are already many pockets of innovation in NARA, especially in the Presidential Libraries. We want to take that culture and spread it throughout agency in a manner consistent with the White House's "Strategy for American Innovation." To that end, we created an Office of Innovation based on an analysis of private sector and government. The goal of the office is to bring together digitization, online access, social media, and a new piece called the Innovation Hub – a lab of changing staff (archivists, IT staff, etc. from both in and out of NARA) to identify and develop innovative projects. The projects undertaken in the Hub should be quick to complete with the mindset to be ready to fail fast and learn from it, as we try to find new and effective ways to serve our customers. NARA will announce the new Chief Innovation Officer soon and will stand up the organization thereafter. She asked the group for any advice. Mr. Ferriero acknowledged the existing level of innovation in the Presidential Libraries, commenting that the distance from Washington allows them to fly under the radar. He said the agency needs to capture some of that spirit and not have it be such a hassle to experiment. Wall agreed, saying by no means will innovation be centralized in this new office.

Tom McNaught commented that NARA's lack of investment in technology personnel hurts. Tom Putnam said his Library has been able to find expertise, but NARA has to rethink its investment in technology. Ms. Wall agreed. Mr. Cheatham observed that cloud computing and virtualization allow NARA to develop very rapidly at a lower cost. Mr. McNaught said NARA used to be a barrier to development - not a good position for the agency. Mr. Lindsey asked if the government's budget situation will hamper NARA's innovation. Ms. Garland answered that in her experience having less resources actually forces organizations to become more creative in their approach. Mr. Lindsey asked if that was possible with OMB's oversight? Mr. Ferriero said in terms of oversight NARA's situation is not that different from a university setting. Ms. Wall said innovation should happen without us having to hide it. Stephanie Streett agreed, saying everyone's efforts would have so much more impact if we worked together and not under the radar. Mr. Ferriero concluded by saying he expects a heavy influence of the Presidential Libraries in this new office, not just in terms of technology but also in areas like processing activities to address backlogs.

Updates - Trust Fund (Cheatham)

Mr. Cheatham described the history of the Trust Fund and then gave an overview of fund's performance in FY 2012. 2012 marked the first time revenue from admissions exceeded revenue from reproduction orders. He noted the large increase in FY 2012 came almost entirely from the Disney exhibit at the Ronald Reagan Library, with sales of 1940 Census reproductions also responsible for some of the increase. Duke Blackwood (Director of the Ronald Reagan Library) said while the increase in the Trust Fund is due to the increased attendance at the Reagan

Library, the costs of the Disney exhibit (both for the foundation and the Trust Fund) are being recouped from a \$6 upcharge in admissions prices. Mr. Baker and Mr. Blackwood clarified that the \$6 fee is divided between the foundation and the Trust Fund in a manner proportionate to the costs absorbed by both organizations.

Mr. Calvaruso asked if the Trust Fund data is available for each facility? Mr. Cheatham replied the annual report includes income/expense reports for everyone.

ACTION ITEM 6: NARA will share FY 12 Trust Fund Annual Report with the Advisory Committee. NARA will also distribute Trust Fund reports for individual Libraries as well as historical data on Trust Fund performance.

Mr. Cheatham said the Presidential Libraries had 57% of Trust Fund revenue in FY 2012. Most Libraries showed increases, while some decreased. The Nixon and Ford Libraries had high percentage increases, but the largest figure was the Reagan Library's increase. Overall the expenses in the Libraries fell by 6% from FY 2011, with most of this the result of one-time Nixon Library exhibit expenses in FY 2011. Larry Temple asked what is the "Other" category of revenue, to which Mr. Cheatham replied "Other" is primarily space rentals. Mr. Cheatham said he expects fairly consistent and stable expenses and revenue in FY 2013 once the spike from the Disney exhibit is done. He noted every Presidential Library had a positive result in FY 2012 once investment income is factored in.

Mr. Teasley asked for a report on the Gift Fund? Mr. Cheatham said the Gift Fund report is in draft form, and while he did not know if the report provides data on an individual Library basis he would look into it. Mr. Teasley asked if a check made out to the Eisenhower Library comes to Washington for the Gift Fund. Cheatham confirmed that.

ACTION ITEM 7: The CFO will look into providing Gift Fund data on an individual Library basis and will provide whatever information is possible to the Advisory Committee.

Updates – George W. Bush Library (Brian Cossiboom and Alan Lowe)

Mr. Cossiboom (of the George W. Bush Foundation) began the update on the George W. Bush Library by noting they are fortunate to have a twenty-four acre site from their partner Southern Methodist University (SMU). While the Bush Library may be the most urban Presidential Library, fifteen of the twenty-four acres of the site have been designed as an urban park. In the overview of the LEED Platinum facility Mr. Cossiboom showed photos of the groundbreaking ceremony, the topping off of the facility, and its current state. Among the George W. Bush Foundation's areas of emphasis are global women's health, human freedom, education reform, women's initiative, military service initiative, and the 4% growth project.

Mr. Lowe (Director of the George W. Bush Library) said the effort to get the Bush Library up and running is making amazing progress. He praised the Library's permanent facility, noting the quality of the work areas in the building and the final production stages in the exhibit area. In a brief description of the museum Mr. Lowe noted some of the exhibits, including the Decision Point Theater (a scenario-based interactive exhibit); a full-sized Oval Office, from where you can walk into Texas Rose Garden; and a beam from the World Trade Center that is part of an exhibit on 9/11. The Library is adding staff, setting up a workstudy relationship with SMU, adding volunteers, and preparing for Trust Fund operations. He added the move of records and artifacts to the permanent facility is underway and should be completed in early 2013. Mr. Lowe said the Joint Use Agreement between NARA and the Bush Foundation has been agreed upon and will be signed in April, the Interim Occupancy Agreement for the facility is already in place, and the Report to Congress for the Library has been submitted.

Archival processing is underway at the Library, and while there are no firm processing targets Mr. Lowe said there will be a significant opening of records in April. In describing the close working relationship the Library has with SMU Mr. Lowe recounted the First Ladies conference hosted by the Bush Center at SMU in March 2012 and the series of programs the Library is starting with SMU on Presidential Histories and Memoirs. He noted that education programs are underway (in the form of teacher workshops) and that the Library will soon be using its large multi-purpose room for education programming. Mr. Lowe said he is especially excited at the potential of joining students at the Bush Library with students at the Reagan Library through the linking of the two sites' White House Situation Room components.

Mr. Cossiboom and Mr. Lowe concluded the presentation by reminding the group of the date of the dedication of the George W. Bush Library, April 25, 2013.

Public Comment

Mr. Ferriero asked the members of the public in attendance for comment. Sharon Fawcett said she wanted to encourage the continuing partnership between NARA and the Advisory Committee, especially in seeking ideas from the foundations for continued sustainability of the Presidential Library system.

Next Meeting

Mr. Ferriero observed that the Advisory Committee typically meets in the spring, but that this year would bring the meeting in conflict with the dedication of the George W. Bush Library. He added that the group had agreed to two meetings a year, but perhaps the group could wait to meet again next fall. Mr. Temple offered to host a meeting at the LBJ Library, and Mr. Gardner

pointed out the presidential sites conference that will be hosted by the Clinton Library in 2014. It was also noted that the Kennedy Library has offered to host the next meeting in Boston. Mr. Ferriero said the date of the next meeting will be shared with the group at a later time.

Action Items

ACTION ITEM 1: The Archivist wants follow up conversation on this topic at the next Advisory Committee meeting. NARA will give the Foundations the final charter and a charge with requested areas of focus. The Foundations will report on what they propose to do in support of this analysis as well as with any questions they have on the project.

UPDATE: The Sustainability Working Group prepared a draft report for the Archivist in September 2013. The report remains an internal NARA draft document. Discussions with the Foundations regarding specific strategies will begin at the next Advisory Committee meeting.

ACTION ITEM 2: The Office of Presidential Libraries will distribute the SOP developed by the Strategy and Communications Office to the Presidential Libraries once that SOP is available.

UPDATE: The Office of Presidential Libraries will distribute the benchmarking SOP from the Strategy and Communications Office when it is finalized.

ACTION ITEM 3: NARA will provide an update on its benchmarking analysis at the next Advisory Committee meeting and will share information on the benchmarking effort in the mean time. In addition, the members of the Advisory Committee will share their ideas for benchmarking candidates with NARA.

UPDATE: This topic will be reconsidered for a future meeting date.

ACTION ITEM 4: NARA will provide a copy of the Glenbow Museum article on the institution's deaccession process.

UPDATE: A copy of "Deaccessioning as a collections management tool" (from *Museums and the Future of Collecting*) is provided as a separate document with the minutes.

ACTION ITEM 5: NARA provide funding trend for Presidential Libraries from FY 2009 – FY 2012.

UPDATE: The slide showing the funding trend is provided as a separate document with these minutes.

ACTION ITEM 6: NARA will share FY 12 Trust Fund Annual Report with the Advisory Committee. NARA will also distribute Trust Fund reports for individual Libraries as well as historical data on Trust Fund performance.

UPDATE: Here is the link to the 2012 Trust Fund Annual Report:
<http://www.archives.gov/about/plans-reports/trust-fund/2012-annual-report.pdf>. Trust Fund reports and historic data on the Trust Fund have been distributed to the Library Directors to share with their Foundation counterparts.

ACTION ITEM 7: The CFO will look into providing Gift Fund data on an individual Library basis and will provide whatever information is possible to the Advisory Committee.

UPDATE: The Gift Fund data on an individual library basis was provided in the End of Year Financial Summary Statement sent to each Director in February, for foundation distribution.