

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS
MEETING #31
JUNE 12, 2006
THE U.S. CAPITOL BUILDING
ROOM H-137

MINUTES

Members of the committee in attendance: Karen Haas, Chair (Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives); Emily J. Reynolds, Co-Chair (Secretary, U.S. Senate); Allen Weinstein (Archivist of the U.S.); Richard A. Baker (Historian, U.S. Senate); Robert Remini, (Historian, U.S. House of Representatives); 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); Guy L. Rocha (Nevada State Archivist, Nevada State Library and Archives)

The meeting opened at 10:08 a.m.

I. Chair's Opening Remarks – Karen Haas, Clerk of the House

Karen Haas welcomed all committee members, thanked them for their continued efforts on behalf of the committee, and described recent developments in the Office of the Clerk.

A new edition of the *Biographical Directory of the United States Congress, 1774 to 2005*, last updated in 1989, was published in January of this year. It is available in all Federal Depository Libraries and the Government Printing Office (GPO). It includes updated biographies and information on approximately 12,000 Members, from the Continental Congress through the 108th Congress. This massive and frequently referenced publication is the result of the joint undertaking of the House Office of History and Preservation and the Senate Historical Office.

The Office of History and Preservation is in the process of completing editorial work on an updated and vastly expanded edition of *Women in Congress*, which is planned to be sent to GPO this summer. It represents an enormous amount of research and features individual profiles on the 229 women who have served in Congress, historical essays, appendices, historical images, statistical charts and graphs, and a full index.

The Clerk's office also continues to expand its oral history project, which was established in 2004 to interview longtime House staff. To date, approximately 40 hours of interviews with staff—some of whose service began 60 to 70 years ago—have been recorded.

Haas acknowledged the House Historian, Dr. Robert Remini, and applauded the publishing of *The House: The History of the House of Representatives*. Haas also mentioned the C-SPAN special "The Capitol" in which the Architect of the Capitol, the Senate, and House offices represented themselves very well. The special contained film footage of many areas not accessible to the public, and also live commentary by congressional experts, many of whom are in the room today. Haas ended her report with an invitation to tour the Capitol Visitor Center after the meeting's conclusion.

II. Recognition of Co-Chair – Emily Reynolds, Secretary of the Senate

Haas recognized the Secretary of the Senate and Co-Chair of the Advisory Committee, Emily Reynolds.

Reynolds first topic of discussion was the tax issue raised at the last meeting. She hopes that there will be an interim status report to the committee at the December 2006 meeting. The Secretary's office is in the process of scheduling meetings with the Senate Finance Committee and the Joint Committee on Taxation to explore the issue further.

Reynolds then acknowledged Dick Baker, the Senate Historian, and Diane Skvarla, the Senate Curator, for their work on publications for the Senate. The first, from the Senate Historical Office and written by Baker, is *200 Notable Days: Senate Stories 1787 to 2002*. He is also preparing a publication that will serve as an orientation tool for the 110th Congress, which highlights some of the traditions of the Senate from the candy desk on the Senate floor to memorial services.

Diane Skvarla is working on the companion volume to the *Fine Arts Catalog* that was previously published. The volume will include the Senate's graphic arts collection and is scheduled to be published in July 2006.

These are exciting projects that tell the story of the Senate and the Congress. Reynolds thanked Dick and Diane for their continued leadership and for making the history of the Senate come alive both for those who have the pleasure of working there everyday and for a wider audience.

III. Recognition of the Archivist of the United States – Allen Weinstein

Haas recognized Allen Weinstein, the Archivist of the United States, and expressed what a pleasure it has been working with him on the committee.

The Archivist distributed literature to the committee regarding the progress of the “Electronic Records Archives,” and a *New York Times* article and “NARA Staff Bulletin” on the classification and declassification issues. The Archivist then took a moment to congratulate Dr. Remini for his terrific book on the House and invited Dr. Remini to speak at the National Archives in the future.

The Archivist stated that the National Archives is doing what is necessary to work with our friends in the House and Senate to deal with our budget situation. He acknowledged the assistance given by House Appropriations Committee and staff, and expressed appreciation for the funding of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC).

The Archivist discussed the reclassification issue, which he had first learned about in the *New York Times* article last February. The Archivist declared a moratorium in March on the withdrawal of previously declassified materials. He also directed the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO) to conduct an audit of materials already withdrawn, which was completed by ISOO in April. The audit of more than 25,000 documents withdrawn from public access found that more than a third did not contain sensitive information justifying re-classification. In order to underscore the National Archives commitment to access, the Archivist ordered an intensive search of the documents that should be returned to open shelves.

The Archivist also mentioned the June 6 press conference held by NARA and the Nazi War Crimes and Japanese Imperial Government Records Interagency Working Group (IWG) to announce the release of an additional 27,000 pages of CIA name and subject files relating to Nazi and Japanese Imperial War crimes. The release of this information would not have been possible without congressional support. He acknowledged Senator Mike DeWine, Senator Diane Feinstein, and Representative Carolyn Mahoney for their assistance in opening the CIA records.

The Archivist also mentioned the impending auction of the Martin Luther King papers by the King family. The National Archives had attempted to form a consortium with the Museum of African American History and Culture and the Library of Congress to preserve these papers as a national treasure, but this effort failed and the papers will indeed go on the market. He hoped that the papers would not be divided and the collection fragmented among a number of buyers.

The Archivist also noted that the National Archives will open a new exhibit in New York in Federal Hall—the result of a partnership with the National Park Service. Federal Hall is the site where the First Congress met and where the Bill of Rights was drafted.

The Archivist concluded by mentioning the June 19 program honoring President Gerald Ford, a distinguished member of Congress, hosted by the National Archives and the Gerald Ford Foundation: “President Ford’s Washington and the World.” The panel

consisted of Henry Kissinger, Carla Hills, David Gergen, Richard Norton Smith and others who discussed President Ford's presidency.

Dick Baker thanked the Archivist on behalf of librarians, historians, and archivists for the courage he has shown on the reclassification issue, and he remarked that our history needs to be safeguarded and not eroded by the loss of documents or information.

IV. Approval of the Minutes of the Last Meeting

Haas moved to approve the minutes from the last meeting and asked if there were any corrections.

Dick Baker noted on page 3, where it said "Reynolds remarked on a recent project of the Senate Historical Office which held a first time ever reunion of all living former members," that while he would like to take credit that it really was the project of the Office of the Secretary of the Senate with minor assistance from the Senate Historical Office.

Reynolds noted that it should add that the project was also in conjunction with the Library of Congress.

Tim Johnson noted the page 16 reference to a committee "member." He was that member.

The Archivist asked that in his opening remarks on page 5, that the word “story” be substituted for the word “joke.”

The minutes were approved with noted corrections.

V. Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress Fourth Report – Robin Reeder

Haas recognized Robin Reeder, the House Archivist, to discuss the draft Fourth Report.

Reeder noted that during the last meeting in November one of the main comments was that the report had too many voices. To rectify that, Andrew Dodge from the House Office of History and Preservation edited the report extensively. Reeder expressed hope that the report was now more of a reflection of one voice. She also thanked Richard Hunt and staff at the Center for Legislative Archives for their additional editorial assistance. Reeder also mentioned that the committee members’ biographies had been updated.

Haas opened the floor for discussion of the draft report.

Joe Cooper wanted the report to underscore access issues and emphasize the committee’s recommendations on ways to expand access, which are listed among the various recommendations in the Executive Summary section of the report.

He felt that NARA, the Center for Legislative Archives, and the House and Senate Historical Offices have provided excellent access on the web, but that the committee needs to promote and encourage the expansion of access to records as the highest goal. He observed that the discussion of access issues was combined with other subjects in the various sections of the report. As a result, the committee's recommendations on access were not clear. He suggested expanding the section on access in the report.

Cooper then discussed the recommendation to revise "The Documentation of Congress," which was published in 1992. He suggested that additional information should be provided about the original publication since many are not familiar with it.

Cooper also asked about the status of reproducing the records of the first fourteen Congresses. Should there be a recommendation in the report on that project?

Richard Hunt, Director of the Center for Legislative Archives, responded to Cooper's last question. The status of this project is covered in section VII of the report, where it is reported that the National Archives is on track to complete the microfilming of the records of the first fourteen Congresses. If the committee wanted to make a new recommendation, it might consider recommending a pilot project on digitizing the microfilm.

Tim Johnson asked about the references to the “offsite storage facility” in the report and questioned if it denoted something other than the storage at Archives II in College Park, Maryland.

Robin Reeder explained that House records still in the physical custody of the Clerk are stored in a space at the Library of Congress (LOC) before they are transferred to the National Archives. The current records of the 109th Congress, and the previous two Congresses (107th and 108th) are kept in a small storage room there. This LOC storage is what they consider “onsite” storage. “Offsite” storage refers to the Center for Legislative Archives when physical custody of the records is transferred to the Center.

Hunt clarified that House and Senate records after transfer to the Center are stored in the downtown Archives building; legislative branch agencies records and other accessioned records are stored at Archives II.

Johnson, for further clarification, asked if current House records are formally transferred to LOC.

Reeder responded that the records are only in temporary storage on the Hill before they are transferred to the Center for Legislative Archives.

Karen Paul, responding to Joe Cooper's original comment, suggested that it might be helpful to take the recommendations in the Executive Summary and group them under three categories: records management, preservation, and access.

Paul also commented that the report is a summary of what has transpired in the last six years and recommended that the report should also reflect the focus of the next six years.

Baker mentioned an editorial correction which touches on a policy issue. The second line of the Executive Summary says that "this committee was formed in 1990 to focus and increase attention on the status and use of the official committee records of the House and Senate and Members' personal papers." The Advisory Committee's focus extends to all the records of the House and the Senate—much more important than committee records alone. And this tone carries over on page 9 at the end of the first paragraph where there is concern expressed about staff walking off with committee records, and in the very last line it says that "this threatens the continuity of committee history." Baker suggested tougher and broader language. He suggested saying "this threatens the continuity of congressional history"—which elevates the issue beyond committees.

Weinstein asked how Baker would change the wording in those statements.

Baker said he would just remove the word "committee" to say the "official records of the House and the Senate," and at the end he would put in the word "congressional" and take out the word "committee."

Weinstein suggested that there should be a second editing of the entire report simply so that it is reduced to its essentials and more people may then have an opportunity and the time to read it.

Haas noted that the executive summary was drafted to serve as the brief, readable version of the report; people who wanted greater depth and detail would read further into the body of the report.

Paul Gherman asked about the distribution of the report and its recipients.

Reeder explained that it will be a government document available through Federal Depository libraries and an electronic version will be posted on the Center for Legislative Archives' website.

Paul directed the Committee's attention to page 52, item number 7, and the paragraphs that discuss the standing committees history project and the Committee Resource Guides. She recently compared the committee description in NARA's Archival Research Catalog (ARC) to the level of description included in the Center's Committee Resources Guides and was struck by how much more depth and detail are included in the Committee Resources Guides. She would like to see this recommendation ranked higher because these resource guides promote access to information about committees and their records. ARC contains only very minimal descriptions of the series.

The Senate Budget Committee Resource Guide, for example, has been very useful in working with the committee, because it has given the staff the opportunity to see what is in their own records. They have hired an archivist part-time to improve the quality of their records. She thinks that the quality of content description is really important, and would like to recommend that it be brought forward in the committee's recommendations.

Gherman asked if ARC descriptions are searchable by Google? He stated that descriptions of Vanderbilt's archives can now be reached through Google, and usage has gone through the roof.

Richard Hunt asked Bob Spangler, the Archives' Electronic Records specialist, to address the question.

Spangler could not answer definitively and wanted the NARA staff with responsibility for ARC development to provide an accurate answer to the committee.

Alan Lowe asked for a clarification on page 46. When the report talks about ERA and what NARA is doing, how can centers such as the Baker Center and other ACSC members make use of the technology that is developed by NARA for electronic records long-term? If there are electronic records in our individual collections, how can we help ensure their long-term preservation as well?

Weinstein said that the challenge Lowe described is one that the ERA project continues to work on. The National Archives just had a meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archives, which is exploring issues much like the one Lowe raised. His hope is that he will have more to say on this issue at future meetings.

Susan Palmer asked if every member of Congress gets a hard copy of the report.

Haas said that it is available, but did not know if it is distributed to all Members.

Palmer wondered, since this is a report to Congress, whether there is feedback from Members about what the committee is doing, and how much help we are giving them in terms of their records.

Richard Hunt mentioned that John Constance, the Congressional Affairs Officer for the National Archives, noted that the report is distributed to all of the Members on our authorizing and appropriations committees, so it provides a good opportunity for them to get an update on our activities and the challenges we face.

Haas noted a new expression of interest on the House side that occurred recently regarding records. In the discussion of the legislative branch appropriation bill, Representative Jack Kingston asked about the records guidance the House provides Members. Haas noted that the Office of the Clerk is very active on records issues when

Members initially come into Congress and again when they are leaving; but the Office has not been as active in reaching out to Members on a continuing basis between those mileposts. She added that her office works very closely—and on a regular basis—with the committees. She signaled her intention to be more active on the House side helping Members with personal papers issues throughout their careers.

Baker added that when the Senate Historical Office meets with Senators or senior Senate staff, they raise records issues. Just to be able to show them the Fourth Report, even if they don't have the time to read it, and show them what this national committee—this mixed committee of experts—says about the importance of record keeping, is invaluable. Once we can get in the door, the Advisory Committee's report brings enormous status to records issues and recommended practices.

Weinstein noted that the National Archives has a program that might help in that regard. At the end of last year the Archives expanded its outreach to congressional staffs in the districts. The National Archives has conducted regional programs in New England and New York and has plans for virtually every other region within NARA. The National Archives can certainly include the Fourth Report in those programs and have it discussed for district staff members who are interested in what is happening in Washington.

Reynolds remarked that it was a great idea. And, in addition to the work that Dick Baker and Karen Paul do on a daily basis in outreach, Richard Hunt is working with Rick Shapiro from the Congressional Management Foundation to invite all the Senate chiefs-

of-staff down to the National Archives for a tour. This came out of a lunch that Karen Haas and Reynolds had with the Archivist. She thought each of the offices—and there's always room for improvement—will continue to bring the Archives to the attention of folks up here. Allen certainly has been such an activist in that regard to try to get people engaged with the Archives, and we're all on board, so we'll keep pushing.

Weinstein noted a division of responsibility at the Archives. The Archivist gets the credit and John Constance does the work! Weinstein added that Constance organized a very successful tour and briefing for House chiefs-of-staff and that he wanted to do the same for the Senate.

Johnson inquired about the preservation priorities on page 49. Were the recommendations in priority order? In some of the earlier reports there was discussion about records that are at-risk. The thermofax is an example that has been addressed successfully. There may be others that are at-risk that need to move up in the order of the priorities.

Hunt said the thermofax problem was clearly of the first order because the materials would deteriorate so quickly. The Center has completed thermofax replacement in about 80% of those Congresses where that technology was used. We also have an ongoing, at-risk report that we send to the Preservation lab so that other records at-risk make it on to the preservation agenda.

Matt Fulgham, Assistant Director of the Center for Legislative Archives, addressed the committee and discussed the different types of preservation review at the Archives. Archives staff routinely go through House and Senate records for refolding and identifying any records that need special care. The Conservation staff provides tremendous support for the preparation of documents for display in the CVC and provides special treatments for other documents as well.

The Archivist noted that all these activities and achievements are being done within budgetary constraints that are getting tighter and tighter. We've inaugurated a hiring freeze at the National Archives. We've had to implement the freeze given what's happened to our core budget, and we are doing everything we can to deal with a 450-million-page backlog in processing.

Lowe, referring to Johnson's question concerning priorities, asked if the irradiation issue on page 51, should be last, and also whether the wording was accurate from the discussion at the last meeting.

Johnson said he had the same reaction. Irradiation is number 12 on the list and a fairly generic recommendation to "ensure the preservation of all records" is the first on the list. He suggested that since irradiation had been on the agenda for at least two meetings, it should move up higher on the priority list.

Johnson also questioned if the priorities should be stated in a way that attracts attention.

Hunt responded that we can reorder the list in priority order. It grew organically from one meeting to the next, which moved the most recent and pressing issues to the bottom of the list.

Baker said he would be very inclined to do that. He thought it would really be worth the effort.

Hunt agreed to put the preservation recommendations in priority order for the next draft of the report.

Reynolds questioned that same section and on page 50, the status of number 7 and number 8, which were repeated twice.

Haas explained that was a typo and was corrected in a later draft version.

Reynolds suggested on page 38 (regarding the CVC) to change “spring of 07” to “2007.”

Baker mentioned that the second paragraph of the executive summary and the treatment of the Visitor Center ends abruptly. He suggested the phrasing should say the “transformation of the Capitol into a visitor friendly environment.”

Joe Cooper said maybe we should say “more visitor friendly,” because that implies it wasn’t visitor friendly.

Baker commented that in fact it has not been visitor friendly. It has been visitor hostile and it has gotten worse over the last couple of years.

Haas asked for any additional questions, comments and suggestions on how to proceed. She asked if the committee would like to go back for a redraft on some of the recommendations that have been made thus far.

Guy Rocha asked when the report would be published, so that the committee could have a timeframe for review and comments.

Haas answered that ideally we had looked for approval at this meeting, but we are not there yet. She asked for input from Hunt, Reeder, and Paul.

Reeder said the report would have a publication date of December 31, 2006.

Haas said we will need to re-circulate these modifications and give the committee a timetable to respond at that point. The timetable will depend on how quickly we can get the modifications back to the group for review.

Rocha thanked Haas and asked if it would be at the next meeting. He also suggested that Reeder could send an email to the committee to inform them of the dates when comments were due.

Haas responded affirmatively, asked the committee to give additional feedback, and to let her know if they would need additional time. She promised to give the committee as much time as possible for review.

Rocha asked if Haas envisioned the next meeting of this body in November or December for formal action.

Haas said the next meeting would be held within that timeframe. The Legislative schedule will determine when we can meet again.

VI. Report on the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress – Karen Paul

Haas recognized Karen Paul, Senate Archivist.

Paul reported ACSC met at the Thomas Dodd Research Center on May 9-11, 2006, in Storrs, Connecticut. This was the first time that the group met outside the Washington, D.C. area and forty-six members attended. A copy of the agenda and of Senator Dodd's remarks appear in the briefing books. The remarks can also be found on the ACSC website because the group thought they were particularly poignant and meaningful to ACSC and for future members.

Max Evans of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission (NHPRC) gave the keynote address, and reminded participants that NHPRC had funded the Congressional Papers Project Report in October 1986. Paul noted that many of the recommendations in the report have been incorporated into contemporary records guidance. Evans suggested that since 20 years had passed that it might be time for NHPRC to consider supporting another conference to take a look at the progress made and to create a white paper that would map out future directions for ACSC.

Evans spoke positively about ACSC and said he would like to see it grow and strengthen. The association of congressional centers, for example, may find it useful and economical to form a consortium in the future to preserve electronic records collectively.

Paul summarized the points made by authors of recent works on Congress who used congressional collections. David Barrett, author of *The CIA and Congress: the Untold Story from Truman to Kennedy*, discussed his use of congressional papers. He visited 18 archives, in addition to the National Archives and the Presidential Libraries, and found an incredible wealth of documentation including transcripts of personal conversations, telephone conversations, staff memos, and a diary of Senator H. Alexander Smith that together told the story of “episodic oversight of [the CIA] by Congress.” He discovered that this oversight was never systematic or comprehensive. While not terribly aggressive, at times congressional attention and involvement were strong and direct.

Paul observed how illuminating the historical panels have been because they identify the records of high value to researchers. Joseph Frye, for example, spoke about a “Window on the Homefront: the Value of Constituent Correspondence in Understanding American Response to Foreign Policy.” He extensively used constituent correspondence from 1964 to 1975, combined with polling data and oral histories, to study the changing views of people in the South towards the Vietnam War. Frye rated the constituent correspondence as a more valuable source than oral histories because the correspondence provided more immediate and direct perspectives. Paul predicted that this book will establish the research value of constituent correspondence.

Paul noted that other panels focused on the use of online exhibits. Staff from Mount Holyoke discussed the value of an online exhibit on the Ella Grasso papers, which attracted contributions to support the library and other collections.

She added that Betsy Pittman, an archivist at the Dodd Center, outlined the descriptive system used at the Dodd Center that allowed Google to search and index their congressional papers collections. This access has increased use by researchers, mainly non-academics and the general public.

Paul emphasized the observations of former Representative Glen Browder, now with the Department of Political Science at Jacksonville State University, who spoke about “What I learned about my own collection as I processed it.” He discovered the record of his

public service was a “historical mess,” and concluded that he alone had to process the collection to allow future users to make sense of his collection.

Browder recommended that ACSC be further strengthened and professionalized. He also suggested that he would like to see an advocacy group formed of former Members of Congress who would meet new Members and brief them on records issues. He felt that new Members would be more apt to listen to former Members, and he volunteered to raise the issue with the United States Association of Former Members of Congress.

Paul summarized a session on congressional centers, which featured Sheryl Vogt, head of the Russell Library, and Alan Lowe, Director of the Baker Center. Their presentations described the varied paths to success for model congressional centers. The Congressional Papers Roundtable, in fact, has asked to publish their presentations in the *American Political Archives Reader*, from Scarecrow Press.

Paul noted the highlight of the ACSC business meeting, where the members approved a structure for dues. Paul predicted that this financial commitment bodes well for the future of ACSC.

VII. Activities Report of the Center for Legislative Archives – Richard Hunt

Haas recognized Richard Hunt, Director of the Center for Legislative Archives at the National Archives.

Hunt reported on the status of the “treasures” vault. He stated that construction was complete and the vault was scheduled to be ready to receive records in August. The “treasures” are scheduled to move back from Archives II for September tours. Before the records return, the Preservation Office will have monitored and reported on the air quality over 30- and 60-day periods. Perhaps at the next meeting we will be able to host a vault tour.

Hunt reported on a meeting set up by Ben Myers, the Archivist for the Architect of the Capitol, to meet with the chief information officer and the IT staff to talk about the management and preservation of electronic records. The AOC is exempt from the Federal Records Act and maintains their records themselves. Laurence Brewer from the Life Cycle Management Division of the Modern Records Program at the National Archives conducted the briefing for the AOC staff.

AOC staff have agreed to schedule a second briefing for CIO’s and IT staff throughout the legislative branch. National Archives experts will discuss common challenges and state-of-the-art solutions to the challenges of managing and archiving electronic records. This is a very promising opportunity to reach out to legislative branch managers on electronic records issues.

Hunt also noted that the Congressional Research Service (CRS) is working with the National Archives on a records schedule. The scheduling of CRS records has been on this committee’s agenda for a decade, so this promises to be a great accomplishment.

All of the work that we do at the Center is due to the incredible talents of a small staff of 20. In the past five years, 25% of our most experienced staff members have retired, but we have been able to find talented replacements before the hiring freeze, and we are back to full strength.

Donald Collier, who is not present, but well known to many, is in charge of the technicians and holdings maintenance operations, and also a part of the congressional loan process. He monitors loans to ensure that House and Senate records are returned to support the current business needs of the committees.

Sharon Fitzpatrick, who is my new administrative assistant, keeps me organized, on task, and on schedule.

I am also very happy to announce that we have hired an old friend and colleague, Ken Kato, who was formerly the Chief of the House Office of History and Preservation and also a former member of the Center for Legislative Archives. He is a great addition to our team.

Haas then thanked Hunt for all the work that the Center does and for helping put the meeting together.

Haas asked if there was any new business.

Haas introduced Ted Clark, the IT Director for the House Committee on Ways and Means, and asked him to talk about some projects of interest to the committee. Clark was formerly the Information Systems Manager for Senator Jim Talent's office.

Clark displayed information and images on slides to describe a document management system he helped to develop for Senator Talent's office in 2004. The goal of the project was to create a knowledge management system using web-based document libraries to store and retrieve documents and information created by office staff. Clark demonstrated how this approach provided powerful indexing and searching tools, allowed correspondence and legislative work products to be tracked through the drafting, review, and approval process, distributed and tracked information from the Washington office to district offices, and generally improved the management and productivity of the office.

Clark also briefly mentioned his current work on archiving a complete capture of the House Ways and Means Committee's website for the 109th Congress to provide a full and accurate record of the committee accomplishments over time. He has met with NARA staff and is familiar with NARA standards and tools for the capture of web records. He and his colleagues are continuing to experiment with different tools and strategies to achieve the complete capture of the committee's website.

Haas thanked Clark for his presentation and asked if there was any other new business.

A motion to adjourn was introduced, seconded, and passed.

The committee adjourned at 11:38 p.m.

