

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS  
MEETING # 27  
JUNE 7, 2004  
ROOMS S-219, THE CAPITOL

MINUTES

Members of the committee in attendance: Emily J. Reynolds, Chair (Secretary, U.S. Senate); Jeff Trandahl (Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives); John W. Carlin (Archivist of the U.S.); Richard A. Baker (Historian, U.S. Senate); Joseph Cooper (Department of Political Science, Johns Hopkins University); Paul Gherman (University Librarian, Vanderbilt University); Timothy Johnson (Curator of Special Collections, Wilson Library, University of Minnesota); Alan C. Lowe (Executive Director, Howard H. Baker Jr. Center for Public Policy, University of Tennessee); Susan Palmer (Professor of History, Department of History, Aurora University); Stephen Van Buren (University Archivist and Head of Special Collections, South Dakota State University)

The meeting opened at 10:00 a.m.

**I. Chair's Opening Remarks—Emily Reynolds, Secretary of the Senate**

Emily Reynolds welcomed everyone to the meeting and noted that all the Advisory Committee members were in attendance. She noted that it was a sad, historic week in the nation's capital and that she was sure that all members of the committee joined her in extending condolences to Mrs. Reagan. Reynolds stated that there were many interesting items before the committee, including presentations on new technologies and the progress of the Capitol Visitor Center. She congratulated Richard Hunt on being named the Director of the Center for Legislative Archives and thanked John Carlin for having made that decision.

**II. Recognition of Co-chair—Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House**

Reynolds recognized co-chair, Jeff Trandahl, and remarked that she always looks forward to their quality time together at their Monday meetings.

Trandahl stated that he would need to leave the meeting to make plans for the week of bereavement and thanked the Advisory Committee members for attending. He thanked Carlin for his contributions and looked forward to working with him for the rest of the time that he is the Archivist. Trandahl noted that Carlin had been a pleasure to work with and that he had always been incredibly responsive on many issues and problems. He stated that Carlin's service will be long remembered and appreciated.

Carlin thanked Trandahl.

Trandahl stated that he had to leave the meeting to plan the week's events with the Speaker.

Reynolds thanked Carlin for his service and looked forward to working with him through the transition to a new Archivist. One of the great joys of her job has been working with Carlin, Hunt, John Constance, and others in the room. She has come to appreciate NARA and recognized that Carlin's leadership has made a critical difference.

### **III. Recognition of the Archivist of the United States—John Carlin**

Carlin thanked Reynolds. Carlin remarked on his status and age, and stated that in the morning he first checks the *Washington Post* obituaries. If he makes it past that, he goes to the Federal Page to see if he should go to work. Things looked okay, so he came in today.

Carlin noted that Joe Cooper had been the only member of the committee who had served for the nine years that he had been the Archivist. He said that as he thought back over those years two things stand out. One was the advance in digital records. The other was the growth in number of congressional repositories across the country. Consequently, the responsibilities of those at this table had grown. He appreciated the role they and their predecessors had played and acknowledged how having these twice yearly meetings had been helpful to NARA in providing a structure to work with Reynolds, Trandahl, Dick Baker, Karen Paul and others. He thanked them all for their contributions.

He would not review progress made in the Electronic Records Archives since Fynette Eaton would address the topic later. He believes that it is appropriate for the committee to meet periodically at NARA. He estimated that the renovation would be completed in about a year, making it possible for NARA to host the committee and the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress. Carlin also anticipated the opening of the new theater in September and *The Public Vaults* in November. He looked forward to working on the Capitol Visitor Center. Because of Richard Hunt's talent and experience and the enthusiastic support for him by Reynolds and Trandahl, Carlin stated that selecting Richard Hunt as the Director of the Center for Legislative Archives had been one of the easiest decisions in his nine years as Archivist. He expressed confidence that Hunt would provide the leadership for NARA on the Capitol Visitor Center that would make it mutually beneficial.

Reynolds thanked Carlin and asked if anyone had questions.

Joseph Cooper noted that since he was the senior member of the Advisory Committee, he thought it was appropriate for him to state what a pleasure it had been for the committee to work with Carlin while he led NARA. Cooper observed that Carlin brought confidence, an innovative spirit, and an understanding of what the needs of the nation are. It had been a pleasure and honor to serve with him.

Reynolds thanked Carlin again.

#### **IV. Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting**

Reynolds requested a motion to approve the minutes of the last meeting. Dick Baker so moved, Joseph Cooper seconded, and the minutes were unanimously approved.

#### **V. Capitol Visitor Center Orientation Film—Emily Reynolds**

Reynolds mentioned the synergies between NARA and Congress regarding the Capitol Visitor Center. She has seen enormous progress in the eighteen months that she has been Secretary and has especially found rewarding working on exhibits and an orientation film that visitors will see before they begin their tour of the Capitol. The film producer is Donna Lawrence from Louisville, Kentucky who has produced films for the Constitution Center in Philadelphia, the Lewis and Clark Center in Illinois, Churchill Downs in Louisville, and other prominent venues.

Reynolds asked Marty Sewell in the Architect of the Capitol's Office to lead a brief discussion of the film. She called committee members' attention to a handout of questions that she, Dick Baker, and others have raised with scholars concerning the film and asked the committee for comments and thoughts, particularly on broad themes appropriate for the film. Reynolds intends to convey the committee's suggestions to Lawrence and to the leadership of both the Senate and House and key staff with whom she has been meeting.

Marty Sewell thanked Reynolds for placing this topic before the Advisory Committee at this time because they are beginning the research phase of the orientation film. When visitors arrive at the Capitol Visitor Center, they will receive a timed ticket for the tour which will also serve as admission to the twelve-minute orientation film. At the completion of the film, visitors will leave the theater for the upper level where they will meet Capitol guides for an approximately forty-minute tour of the building. Sewell said that the orientation film, the exhibits, and the building tour are envisioned as complimentary experiences and she invited committee members' ideas concerning how the film could contribute to the overall experience. She encouraged committee members to think less in terms of the content of the film and more about the emotions and ideas they would like the visitors to walk away with.

Susan Palmer suggested emphasizing Congress as an equal partner to the executive branch and to the presidency because the presidency has become such a dominant institution. Another emphasis should be the relationship between the Senate and the House which would point to their differences but also their everyday working relationship.

Sewell said this was a very interesting suggestion because Dick Baker, Ken Kato, Barbara Wollanin and others on the advisory committee for exhibits had stressed the need to organize the exhibit so that it made clear that the House and Senate have different

histories, different powers, different ways of conducting business, and their own cultures. These differences will be presented in the exhibit, and the film could complement them.

Tim Johnson believed it would be effective to weave into the history of Congress how the institution responds both in times of crisis and in moving things forward day in and day out. That kind of story would have an emotional dimension that would fit many events in the history of Congress.

Alan Lowe suggested the need for visitors to leave with less of a sense of mystery concerning how Congress works and with a feeling of the importance of their roles as voters and participants in public policy issues.

Stephen Van Buren suggested that the film should demonstrate linkages between voters and Congress so that visitors leave with a sense of their roles in a representative democracy rather than leave with a sense of just intersecting with the building, exhibits, and a tour.

Cooper noted the difficulty posed by a twelve minute film. Trying to make too many points would likely result in not making any of them very well. He stressed the need to focus clearly on one or two major points and suggested interweaving some other things. Cooper stated that the American people do not understand why Congress is important or how different our system of government would be if we only voted on one person every four years. Congress needs to be presented as the lynchpin of American democracy because it gathers disparate points of view, and in the Senate and in the House requires action that is a mix of viewpoints and interests. Despite the need for presidential leadership and power in this century, Congress still plays the key role as a representative institution. The House and Senate could be worked into this theme by showing how they sum things up differently and how that is another aspect of the whole mix.

Palmer agreed with Cooper and noted that the concerns of Congress are different from the presidency even when they are controlled by the same party.

Paul Gherman agreed that the responsibilities of voting are important, but citizens should also be encouraged to contact their representatives directly concerning their views and problems.

Carlin stated that the feelings visitors take from the film will stay with them much longer than specifics concerning how a bill goes through Congress.

Sewell thanked everyone and stated how helpful the discussion had been.

Reynolds asked Sewell about the timeline. Sewell replied that they hope to have the film completed by December 2005. They are at the initial information-gathering stage, talking to a lot of people, including a scholarly roundtable, and will be gathering their preliminary findings within the next couple of months.

Reynolds said that this is an exciting project and thanked Sewell and the committee for their comments. She invited anyone who had additional suggestions to convey them to Trandahl, Sewell, or her.

## **VI. Electronic Records Archives—Fynette Eaton**

Reynolds welcomed Fynette Eaton of NARA and invited her to address the Electronic Records Archives initiative.

Eaton said that since the committee was aware of ERA, she would focus on where the project now stands. She was excited to report that since the requirements for procurement were issued last December, they had reviewed the bids, had narrowed them to the top three or four submissions, and were expecting to re-review those bids within the next month. The goal is to award two contracts this summer. Those two companies will design an ERA system, compete against each other, so that NARA can make a decision next year on which design best fits their needs. She called attention to the timeline in the handout and noted that they expect to have the system in place in 2007. Much of their research has centered on identifying the existing technologies and where these technologies are going so that the system can deal with any type of electronic records created anywhere in the federal government. She indicated that some of this information is also in the handout.

Reynolds said this is a very exciting project and asked for questions. There were none.

Eaton stated that they have a contact phone number and welcomed questions or comments. She appreciated the support the project had received.

Reynolds commented on the significance of ERA and thanked Eaton.

Carlin commented that he was pleased to see the huge interest in ERA from the private sector because there will be many spin-offs and the private sector understands that the project involves universal needs beyond NARA's immediate requirements. There is a growing recognition that the private sector will also need this new technology and this will provide an incentive to keep on target and within the budget challenges of the next couple of years. Carlin is genuinely excited about the progress they are making.

Cooper stated how impressed he was with this project and stated that Carlin and NARA had done a wonderful job.

Carlin replied that they have wonderful people working on the project.

Reynolds thanked them.

## **VII. Senate Legislative Information Project—Marsha Misenhimer**

Reynolds asked Marsha Misenhimer of the office of the Secretary of the Senate to give the Advisory Committee an overview of the Senate Legislative Information project which she spearheads. Reynolds referred to the ERA presentation and called attention to the large issues and synergies being generated at all levels.

Misenhimer began by noting that to prepare for her presentation she reviewed earlier reports stressing the goal of freeing information from the format in which it was created and to preserve that information so that it is not proprietary. One of the technologies applicable is XML. She remarked that the LIS project is very much focused on XML but the emphasis is now on creating the information and the structure at the outset rather than after the fact. LIS is now concentrating on the best means to capture information from the author at the time it is created and is less occupied with the downstream benefits of having the document in XML, searching, and archiving.

One of the great benefits of XML is that it allows computers to process data in a number of ways. This is important particularly for legislative documents which have a structure and hierarchy but are also variable. For example, the law is not regular in all cases as it has developed over 225 years. They can build a system based on regular patterns, but the styles and structures have changed and there are many exceptions. Much of their work has focused on allowing the creators of the documents to build in those exceptions and still maintain the basic structure. They sat down with users and listened to their needs in order to develop prototypes. The users were adamant that they did not want to be distracted by tags, such as the ones they had experienced in DOS-based systems. They were fine with working with XML but did not want XML to inhibit them. They wanted flexibility with the ability of the computer system to provide checking to assure that the basic hierarchical structure and all of the parts and pieces were there. Another requirement is what they call exchange structure. These documents have to be exchanged from the Senate to the House, from drafters to the enrolling clerk, or over to GPO for printing, and ultimately to the Library of Congress. So they tried to build a system that is easy to use with lots of shortcut keys so that the users can think about the document in terms of what it is and not as a typesetter or how it's ultimately going to look on paper.

They built the application and named it the Legislative Editing and XML Application, or LEXA. In June 2002 they began building the application and deployed it to the Office of the Senate Legislative Counsel in January of this year. A group called the pioneers tested the application. After a two-day training period, the pioneers drafted the first bill in LEXA within a week. The system used today normally requires six months to train a new drafter so their software is very user-friendly. It is much like a word processor, but there is a lot of structure that helps them build a document that they can use.

They have also been going back about three Congresses and converting those documents to XML. They have also been building a document management system for the Senate Legislative Counsel that will not only do workflow but help them track the 20,000 documents or so that they create each Congress. The Senate Legislative Counsel staff is

very excited about this software. After they work out some of the bugs in that office, the system will be introduced in others such as the enrolling clerk and the committees, probably with the Appropriations Committee first. They will add more document types, such as committee reports, committee hearings, and eventually work with the clerks doing the journals, calendars, and *Congressional Record*. The goal is to get all legislative documents into XML format so that they can be processed, archived, shared and searched directly.

Baker asked how far back they were going to convert older documents to this format.

Misenhimer replied that they had converted all the bills and resolutions from the 106<sup>th</sup> Congress (1999-2000) forward but they had encountered numerous technical problems in conversion. When they discovered early on that they were having problems with historical conversion, they concentrated on providing the ability to go back to an earlier Congress—say the 101<sup>st</sup> Congress—and pull a document, convert it to XML, and use that data in a subsequent draft. But to say we could go back many, many Congresses and convert everything is just not feasible.

Hunt asked if they were tracking the changes in a bill as it progressed, and capturing each version, or only capturing the penultimate bill that passed a chamber.

Misenhimer answered that there was a new document at each stage. The Senate Legislative Counsel's document management system will eventually tie into the ones used by the Senate clerks so that version of bills may be easily tracked.

Cooper had three questions. He indicated that Misenhimer had stated that documents would be archived at some point.

Carlin said that is correct.

Misenhimer stated that she knew the paper is archived.

Cooper asked what is happening on the House side.

Misenhimer replied that the House, Senate, Library of Congress, and Government Printing Office have all been working on this project simultaneously. The House has built a slightly different application, but the idea has always been that there is one document type definition so that all the data can flow through the entire legislative branch and be shared.

Cooper asked about the state of public access to the data. Can the public access it fully, in part, or not at all?

Misenhimer said the text of legislation goes to the Government Printing Office to produce the paper. The electronic document then goes to the Library of Congress where they process it for the LIS system, which is internal to the legislative branch, and then to

Thomas. They now produce an HTML document from the locator data and pair that with the PDF document that GPO produces. Ultimately, when all the documents are XML, they will be displayed on the web and all the XML data will be right there behind the screen display.

In February of last year, the House began posting introduced bills as XML documents. So if you go to LIS or Thomas and click a house bill that is in XML, there are links that lead you to other XML documents that the public can retrieve or search. She indicated that the one aspect of XML technology that has not fully evolved is the search engine. The Library of Congress has been working closely with World Wide Web Consortium on developing search standards. Ultimately, when all data is in XML, searching LIS and Thomas as a single system is going to be quite extraordinary.

Cooper wondered about how the system would be used in the future as more people begin to look at the data for historical purposes rather than current usage. That could create some difficulties because he didn't see why some parts would logically belong to the Library of Congress while others would logically belong to NARA.

Misenhimer observed that this is a very good question and added that a third place to find the same information is on the GPO website.

Cooper said that not enough attention seems to be devoted to integrating legislative documents into a single body of material.

Baker announced that several weeks ago, six senators introduced a resolution now in the Senate Rules Committee urging the Librarian of Congress to adapt the LIS technology and integrate it into the Thomas technology. The bottom line is that the public deserves to have the quality of information available internally to members of Congress. There seems to be a recognition that Thomas is getting a bit antiquated and that the Librarian needs to take some leadership in bringing about a smooth transition.

Cooper said it sounded like a little more coordination is needed at this point.

Carlin indicated that there may be more coordination than there appears to be. He drew an analogy to the point at which paper records were still in custody and use by the originating body and the point at which they are permanently accessioned. The discussion has centered on internal, current records. NARA has never been involved with current records still in use by an agency of either executive or legislative branches.

Reynolds remarked that the questions are food for thought for all concerned.

Carlin agreed.

Johnson noted that the widespread use of older browsers unable to access XML documents would slow public access for some time.



Misenhimer agreed but stated that the XML data will have enhanced conversion abilities and that the technology is still evolving and will become more powerful. She said that the database at some point could become so large that the search process would slow. There might be some logical point when the current data at the Library of Congress needs to be rolled off and archived at NARA. There are many questions yet to be answered but fortunately groups such as the Advisory Committee can work toward solutions.

Lowé asked when information is rolled off to NARA, how would that fit in with ERA? Would this system integrate into what NARA is doing?

Carlin responded that they are building a system that will accommodate it and provide preservation and access.

Lowé asked if this technology is easily taken into the system that NARA is creating right now.

Carlin said it would be. He agreed with Misenhimer's basic point about the need to focus on the initial creation of documents and that this was essential to making it simpler for the future.

Misenhimer stated that people should regard documents as data with structures regardless of the specific technology. Data when freed from specific technologies is easier to get into structured formats and that will enable us to preserve documents in a way that has been difficult in the past.

Van Buren asked if they envision access at multiple levels for researchers to remain seamless.

Misenhimer replied that one of the attributes of XML is that if you have specific information inside your document, all kinds of folks can access, view, and work with it.

Johnson asked about the adoption of the new system in offices other than those mentioned by those who gravitate to new technologies.

Misenhimer said there were a handful of people eager to embrace it. Those people had been helpful in asking questions and giving them feedback so that they could adjust features of the system. She mentioned that when an article about the new system appeared in the Secretary's newsletter, *The Unum*, staff from the Appropriations Committee said they wanted to be next in line to adopt it. Because it is a user-friendly system, they will get more and more groups in the Senate interested in using it.

Johnson inquired if it was noted for the record historically which bill was first created in XML.

Misenhimer didn't think so.

Reynolds stated that phase one of this project has had a very happy ending. With all of the issues that they have raised today, there are hopefully many more happy endings to come, including their continued coordination with both the Library of Congress and NARA.

Reynolds asked for any other comments. There were none. She thanked Misenhimer and noted that her presentation and Fynette Eaton's had provided some good food for thought.

### **VIII. Pilot of Document Management System for Senate Offices and the Ohio Congressional Archives – Karen Paul**

Reynolds asked Karen Paul to bring them up to date on a pilot program of a document management system in the Senate offices and also to update them on the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress meeting in May.

Paul stated that perhaps they could have a demonstration of this new document management system at a future meeting of the Advisory Committee.

Reynolds replied that would be great.

Paul indicated that the system, not quite ready for demonstration, is being made available to members offices. There are three offices currently conducting pilots with it. The most crucial thing to know about the system is that it is an open source system accessible via the internet. It is a full security system maintained by the Senate Computer Center.

The pilot offices are currently scanning paper documents into the system. The next step will be inputting electronic documents into the system. A cover sheet is scanned to capture the metadata that includes pointers to the actual documents. The system can generate microfilm for those who have archival concerns. It's possible to build in retention schedules and it can be downloaded to disk or tape. The system also allows integration of e-mail and audio or video. It currently meets NARA standards in terms of transporting databases to NARA. Steve Puglia of NARA has checked the system regarding resolution and technical aspects.

The Senate Historical Office is also beginning to scan in some of their historical subject files which will result in a database of twenty-five years of information. Paul believed this system would allow offices to create useable files and she would imagine offices would begin to use it to store members' speeches, to feed news clippings into it, and other information that they need to retrieve and use again in different ways. If anyone has technical questions, she would be happy to get someone to answer them.

Baker asked about the name of the company that produces the document management system.

Paul replied OnBase. They are in charge of a similar project at the FBI. NARA may be accessioning this system at some point in the future.

Van Buren inquired about getting a locator for the OnBase system. He would like to look at it.

Paul said she would send it to him.

Baker noted they have a web site ([www.onbase.com](http://www.onbase.com)).

Paul also reported on the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, which held its second meeting on May 5 and 6 of this year at the Woodrow Wilson Center. About 34 or 35 people attended. Paul included the minutes of the meeting in the packet provided to Advisory Committee members. If enough of the sessions were taped, the Association would like to have them transcribed and the proceedings made available. Paul pointed to the presentations of congressional scholars Lawrence Dodd and Nancy Young, who discussed archival collections that they have used in their work and what they would like to see the centers that collect and preserve the papers concentrate on. The political scientists identified elements of congressional collections that they wish were better preserved. The meeting concluded with a wonderful dinner at the Capitol and Paul thanked Reynolds for hosting that dinner.

Reynolds agreed that they had a nice evening.

Paul stated that the Association is an outgrowth of the ideas that have come from the Advisory Committee over the years. She regarded the organizing of the Association as the next logical step and one that the Senate Historical Office has been pleased with.

Paul indicated that one of the attendees from Ohio State University brought the pamphlets included in the packet distributed to Advisory Committee members. It reflects the tremendous influence the Advisory Committee has had in the development of documentation centers over the years. The purpose and goals expressed in that pamphlet clearly reflect the priorities of the Advisory Committee's *Third Report*, which was published in December 2000. Their collections policy statement derives directly from the *Documentation of Congress*, which was a publication that the Advisory Committee oversaw over ten years ago. The pamphlet stresses the importance of collaboration between the university libraries and the John Glenn Institute for Public Policy and Public Service. This emphasis is embodied in the *Third Report*. Finally, the staffing section of the pamphlet lists all of the points enumerated in the Congressional Papers Roundtable definition of an ideal center.

Reynolds thanked Paul. Although she was not part of the Association's meetings, she could feel the energy and the high level of discussion at the Capitol dinner. Reynolds thanked Paul again and indicated that perhaps in December the Advisory Committee could be given a demonstration of their document management system. She asked for any other questions or comments for Paul. There were none.

## **IX. Activities Report of the Center for Legislative Archives – Richard Hunt**

Reynolds gave the floor to Richard Hunt for his activities report, noting that she expected him to have much to say about the records of the 9-11 Commission.

Hunt pointed to the challenges modern records present by noting that the 9-11 Commission records are about to be turned over to the Center. Much is yet to be determined and he hoped that in December he would be able to talk about the records in detail and the access policy governing those records. He said that the one certain thing is that the 9-11 Commission is a legislative entity which means that the Center for Legislative Archives will be the custodial unit responsible for those records. They will share some of those responsibilities with the Electronic Records Division, which will take the lead on electronic records, their preservation and authentication, and also with the Special Media Archives Services Division which will maintain the extensive audio visual holdings from the 9-11 Commission. It is a shared responsibility based upon the expertise and skills represented in NARA. The Commission is now preparing its final report and will close shop in the fall. Consequently, the clock is ticking on NARA to prepare for the transfer, preservation, and processing in order for them to be made available according to the terms of access that the Commission will set.

The Commission's final report should be cleared by the White House and is scheduled to be published on July 27, 2004. Supplemental staff reports, some classified, will be made available in July and August. The Commission will officially close in late August, but will retain a skeletal staff through September. For the past few months, NARA has been working with the Commission to make sure this will be an orderly process. The Commission has a staff in New York and staffs at two locations in Washington, with both shared and individual records systems. NARA staff has had to get a handle on that situation and also the technical details about the electronic records systems so they can understand the records, bring them in, process them, and preserve them.

Hunt introduced Bob Spangler from NARA, who has taken the lead on the electronic records issue and is working closely with the Commission IT staff to ensure that these records will be effectively and efficiently transferred. Hunt would refer questions about these records to Spangler. The Commission's electronic records include a document management system with over 400,000 scanned images, e-mail records in a variety of systems, web records, digital video recordings of public hearings, digital audio recordings of hundreds of interviews. Over a million pages of records with the highest security classification were examined by the Commission. These classified records include many that are protected by law enforcement restrictions, that have personal privacy concerns, and that contain memorandum of understanding signed with some of the agencies and the City of New York. NARA and the Center staff will be engaged in some careful screening of these records before they are made available.

The Commission will establish terms of access to the records and NARA will enforce those terms. Since NARA has committed major resources to this project, Hunt wanted the Advisory Committee to be aware that the Center has inherited this new responsibility and he invited their guidance as they move forward.

Lowe asked how they were coordinating their effort with the two other offices at NARA concerning screening and processing.

Hunt replied that the Center takes the lead but shares responsibilities with the other offices and takes advantage of the specialists within those offices. The coordination of effort now primarily concerns intellectual control and understanding what is there and what has to be done before the records are transferred so that they are authentic and usable. The screening process will be tackled later.

Gherman asked how quickly it is possible to shift resources when confronted with a major collection like this and is there special funding to support the project?

Hunt stated there is no special funding. This is part of the Center's job and it's also why he asks Michael Kurtz for additional help from other offices.

Kurtz said he was sure he could be helpful. This is absolutely a major priority and they would be working closely together to make sure everything is coordinated in processing, preserving, and accessing these records. Hunt and his staff would have the final say, with assistance, on the access issues.

Carlin emphasized they do not have money waiting when such things come along. Although Dr. Kurtz will free up resources to help as much as possible, there will be other things not done as a result. It is a high priority and a huge test for them because of the multiple formats, variety of records, and the high interest in access.

Baker recalled the arrival of the JFK Assassination Review Records which basically redirected a lot of the Center for Legislative Archives' resources. He agreed with Carlin that other things were not done because of that huge burden. He hoped that there will be relief.

Hunt stated they would keep the Committee posted on the status of these challenges.

Reynolds said to please keep them posted. She asked for any other questions or comments for Hunt. There were none. She noted they had covered a lot of ground and she appreciated everybody's attendance and input. Dick Baker would lead the Advisory Committee members to the Rotunda where Tom Fontana of the Capitol Visitor Center would take them outside for an overview of that project. Reynolds thanked everyone.

The meeting adjourned at 11:11 a.m.