

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS
MEETING #42
JUNE 25, 2012
CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER
SVC 212-10

Members of the Committee in attendance: Nancy Erickson, Chair (Secretary of the Senate); Karen Haas, Co-Chair (Clerk of the House); David Ferriero (Archivist of the United States); Don Ritchie (Historian, U.S. Senate); Matthew Wasniewski (Historian, U.S. House of Representatives); Terry Birdwhistell (Associate Dean of Special Collections and Digital Programs and Director, Wendell H. Ford Public Policy Research Center, University of Kentucky); Sharon Leon (Director of Public Projects, Center for History and New Media, George Mason University); Jeff Thomas (Archivist, Ohio Congressional Archives, The Ohio State University); Sheryl Vogt (Director, Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies); Steven Zink (Vice-President of Information Technology, and Dean of the University Libraries at the University of Nevada, Reno).

Also Present: Karen Paul, Archivist, Senate Historical Office, U.S. Senate; Robin Reeder, Archivist, Office of Art and Archives, U.S. House of Representatives; and Richard Hunt, Director, Center for Legislative Archives, National Archives and Records Administration.

The meeting started promptly at 10:00.

ERICKSON: Good morning, and happy summer, everyone. It's my honor to welcome you all to this semiannual meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress. And we've got a full agenda today. And this morning I think the most important item on our agenda is the discussion of the draft fifth report of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress. Needless to say, I think when you read the draft report it's evident that we made incredible progress in the last five and a half years. I know that I felt extremely proud of your work in reading the report. And I remember five and a half years ago when we gathered, I believe it was in the LBJ Room, my first meeting with then Lorraine Miller, and we were talking just about the issues surrounding electronic archiving, and it seemed a little overwhelming and daunting at the time. But after you read the draft report it's evident that we've come a long way. And I appreciate the steady guidance of this committee, your enthusiasm, as well as the work of your predecessors who got us to the point where we are today.

Another agenda item relates to legislative commissions. And you'll recall at the last meeting that we agreed to form a task force after we heard from Richard some of the issues that his staff struggle with with respect to legislative commissions who open their

records in some cases in less than five years to the public. Many of these commissions are dealing with very sensitive information that requires a great deal of work in the screening of these records in order for them to be made public. So we had agreed to form a task force and I look forward later in this meeting to a report on the progress that the Senate and House has made in their research on this issue.

Next I'd like to thank our Archivist David Ferriero for finding money, which is no easy task these days, and also skirting a hiring freeze in allowing the Center for Legislative Archives to hire an IT specialist to replace Ashley Smoot. And I am proud that their new hire is someone with a great deal of Senate experience in Brandon Hirsch. I believe Brandon worked for many years for Senator Dorgan and most recently for Senator Pryor and I think it's fair to say, Richard, he probably has been able to hit the ground running. I think that he'll be an incredible asset given his experience in working in a personal office in helping us in our efforts to continue the momentum that we have on the electronic records front.

And then finally I'd like to thank Kate Mollan and Adam Berenbak from the National Archives for helping us archive our Senate special event records. We have records dating that are probably 50 years old. Many of them relate to the activities of our Senate spouses. And these records had never been screened or archived before. So we appreciate their help in tackling the mountain of records that we have. And I'm hopeful that someday they will be featured in a great exhibit at the National Archives.

Now I'd like to turn to the House Clerk, Karen Haas. We work closely together on a number of issues ranging from continuity of government issues to implementing the Lobbying Disclosure Act. We're busy, our staffs are busy getting ready to implement the STOCK Act requirements that will mean that members and staff will report their stock transactions on the Internet in a searchable, downloadable manner. So I appreciate our close working relationship on a number of issues. And it's a real honor for me to cochair this committee with Karen.

HAAS: Good morning. Let me second Nancy's welcome to the group. It's really great to see everybody here. I'd also like to especially thank Sharon Leonfor being here today as my representative here to the committee from George Mason. And also Jeff Thomas, who's the Speaker's appointee to the committee from Ohio State. So we appreciate having you here today.

I thought at this time I'd like to report on some of the things that have been going on in the House since we met last. In February we participated and helped organize a conference titled Achieving Greater Transparency in Legislatures through the Use of

Open Document Standards. Participants from legislatures all over the world attended, and I'd especially like to thank the Secretary for her participation in that conference. Topics discussed included open document standards with an emphasis on transparency and efficiency. The conference delegates agreed to establish a working group on open document standards. The first working group held a meeting in May at the European Parliament in Brussels, Belgium.

And while we're on the topic of transparency and document standards, the House rules for the 112th Congress were amended to address greater transparency and accessibility to legislative documents. The Speaker and House leadership directed the Clerk to create a centralized repository to provide access to documents that will be considered in committee and by the House. Phase one of this project was completed in January of this year when docs.house.gov went live to the public. Phase two of this project is under way. It focuses on committee documents and is scheduled to go live in January of 2013.

The Office of Art and Archives has been working with the Center for Legislative Archives and the Senate Historical Office on the Next-Generation Finding Aids Project. I know that the Center for Legislative Archives will be discussing this project in more detail. We acquired the software Archivists' Toolkit, which is the software recommended by the Next-Generation Finding Aids Task Force. My staff has been busy inputting information into the software on records currently open at the Center. And they have also been using the software internally for documenting closed House records.

The Office of Art and Archives has also been working on a new Web site with the Office of the House Historian. The Web site on art, archives and history will provide one-stop shopping to researchers, who will not only be able to find information on House history but also images and objects in the House collection and finding aids describing House records. The Web site will be up and running this fall. We're all very excited about that.

And finally the Office of Art and Archives is supporting the Office of the House Historian on a forthcoming book titled Hispanic Americans in Congress. Art and Archives is providing photo research including images from the House collection as well as photos from other repositories. The book will also include locations of research collections for Hispanic members of Congress.

We are moving forward with preparations for the end of the 112th Congress, as I know the Secretary is. The Office of Art and Archives is busy working with committees in the transfer of their records. We've also been spending a lot of time with members that are going to be leaving the House. And at this point we have 57 members that fit into that

category. We're also participating with the Chief Administrative Officer in his briefings for the parting members.

In closing, again I'd like to thank Nancy for hosting us here today. And I look forward to hearing remarks by other members of the committee and also our discussion here. Thank you.

ERICKSON: Thanks, Karen. David.

FERRIERO: Good morning. I want to update you on four or five different activities since we last met. First, in terms of the transformation of the National Archives and our reorganization we have made some key appointments that you should know about. One is—finally—we have an executive for Research Services. This is the point person for all customer service, and I'm pleased to report that Bill Mayer, most recently the director of libraries at American University, has joined us and has hit the ground running. He has a long history of focus on the customer, students, faculty, and external users. And "100" years ago Bill and I worked together in the MIT library. So I'd like to think that he learned some of that during those years.

We've also recently appointed a director of Education and Public Programs,--Maria Marable-Bunch will be joining us on July 2nd. She comes to us from the US Capitol Visitor Center. So she already has some experience working with the National Archives and we're really excited about that.

And the last one is our new director of the Federal Register, Charlie Barth, who is currently the records manager for the Department of the Navy. He'll be joining us as director of the Federal Register. Charlie is one of our high-power electronic records users. He is the poster boy actually for the Electronic Records Archives. So we're really pleased to have him on board in this new relationship.

A few words about the budget--my favorite topic and the thing that keeps me up at night the most. And the news is not good. We are looking at a decrease in the budget from Fiscal Year 2011, which was \$434 million, down to \$392 million. So that has a serious impact on our ability to do our job. And it's compounded by the fact of the sequestration hanging over us. And unless something happens to change that the budget will end up at somewhere around \$352 million.

So we are seriously looking at all possible ways of reducing the impact on the various services that we provide, and, as Nancy mentioned, one of the things that we did earlier was to institute a hiring freeze. Every position now as it comes open is being reviewed.

To give you some data: we instituted this on November 21st, 2011. And since then we have reviewed 274 positions, and 71% of those, 194, have been approved. If you don't know, we are in 44 facilities around the country. So just to let you know, 43% of those are located here in DC, and the rest outside of the District. And we have to date saved about \$3.4 million as a result of this hiring freeze. So that's just an example of one of the things that we're doing to reduce the impact of the budget situation. The budget situation is compounded by new guidance from OMB that requires us to reduce travel, reduce information technology expenditures, printing, motor vehicles, contracts and real property.

Real property is an issue for us. We're expecting guidance from OMB at the beginning of August that will clarify this. But we're being told by OMB that we can't acquire any new real estate. This is a huge problem for us since we're opening a presidential library in April. And of special interest to you is the fact that our Washington National Records Center, in Suitland, where we provide courtesy storage for papers of members of Congress, we have also recently discovered 1,200 cubic feet of congressional records are sitting there. We have had, for probably 12 years now, but a request in for replacement of Suitland because of the physical conditions. It was in our latest approval through OMB, but approval was pulled within the last couple of months. We're working closely with GSA, our landlord, to get that reinstated through the OMB process. There are a couple of really high profile impacts that this restriction on real estate is going to have for us. And I'll keep you apprised on those.

So I talked about the recent discovery of the records at Suitland. Suitland is a facility that was created by pulling together about six different collections from around the country to one near Washington, D.C. to provide ready access to records from departments and agencies in Washington. Also what it did was to combine all the problems of six different facilities in one facility, and no one ever dealt with the problems. So now we're in the process of dealing with those problems and getting some intellectual control over what we have. And that's how we discovered these congressional records that were deposited there in the '80s. So more on that as we move forward.

I'm pleased to report that the Congressional Records Instance of ERA is live, finally. The hardware is in place. It is up and running and ingesting records after a long and arduous process. Archivists' Toolkit--as of this morning--I have the green light for the National Archives to be participating. We figured out a way to crosswalk to our existing system.

HUNT: Wonderful; it's news to me.

FERRIERO: Yes. Well, I just got it this morning. And no arm twisting involved. That's an in-house joke. And finally, I'd like to report on our research fellowship. If I have a legacy to leave in my work at the National Archives, it will be to have created an endowed opportunity for people to come and use the records of the National Archives, whether they're congressional records or agency records. And I'm very proud of the baby step that we've taken with Foundation support for two years now to have the Fellowship for Legislative Archives Research. We have 21 applications this year on a wonderful range of topics from African American politics, home recording technology, the Homestead Act, migration and polarization, and veterans in the welfare state. Several applications are dependent upon our petitions, which I thought was an interesting twist. We're within a couple days of making an announcement on this one. So I'm really pleased. That's it.

ERICKSON: I'm sure those of you who work in state government can relate to the issues that we're all facing on the federal front with respect to the budget cuts that we've already absorbed--and the looming sequestration that could be ahead of us. So we continue to put our heads down and work as efficiently as we can. Next on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the last meeting. Does anyone want to make a motion?

FERRIERO: So moved.

M: Second.

ERICKSON: All in favor say aye.

M: Aye.

F: Aye.

ERICKSON: Those opposed nay. The ayes have it. The minutes are approved. Karen?

PAUL: The Senate archivists are continuing to focus almost exclusively on committee archiving of their digital records. And we remain at 75% of the standing committees. I think I had explained this at the meeting that we had to resort to plan B in terms of archiving. We have been encouraging committees to hire professional archival help, but then the budget crisis has impacted that effort. So plan B was to offer to do the processing and accessioning of the electronic records in our office. And we are currently working on the records of six committees, with the result that our own accessioning backlog has been growing rather than shrinking as these committees are beginning to transfer to us more

and more, I think as their confidence level builds up with our ability to process and maintain the records in a very reliable way.

We do have plans over the summer to begin working with the committees that are not yet participating in this. But our challenge right now is to do this in a way that won't add substantially to our own processing backlog.

We had our first experience in March with a large system change in the Senate. And I wanted to share this with you because I think we learned a number of lessons through this experience. The electronic record archiving has really forced us to work much more closely with Sergeant at Arms staff. The Sergeant at Arms is responsible for all of the digital initiatives and work in the Senate. And over the winter we learned that an e-mail storage system, Symantec Vault, was being eliminated. And the Senate was going to begin to use a new system. And these e-mail storage systems are the systems that store the large volumes of staff e-mail. So we're really talking about accounts that are very substantive. And we had to drop everything to address this. And the three of us, myself and Alison and Elisabeth, our deputy archivists, spent about a month not only to get ourselves up to speed with the new system, but to be able to devise archival guidance that would go out at the same time that the new system was being implemented. And of course this is the ideal. And we were fortunate enough to work with the education and training staff and also with the systems integration people.

And so we were really doing it correctly. We were participating in the deployment of a new system. But what we learned inadvertently through conversations in this process was that the old system was going to be closed down within one week and that there were still approximately 50 accounts on that system. And this was just inadvertent. We wouldn't have thought that there would have been that many accounts just sitting there that were going to disappear. So the good news is that we were able to react within that week and save those 50 accounts. But we came so close. And in stepping back to look at what happened we began to realize how much this is happening in every office of the Senate. This instance was of a large scale system change. But we ask ourselves, how many orphaned accounts exist in everyone's office? So this has really opened our eyes and we are beginning a new effort to reach out to really the systems people in all of the offices. And we have put together some guidance and information. And that will be our big thrust over the summer, is to really begin to deal one on one with all of the systems people as if they were archivists in these offices, because in fact that's what they are, the records really are in their control. And whether or not they survive will depend on these IT people and what they do with the records. I wanted to share that because it's really caused us to reorient our efforts.

In 2011 Elisabeth Butler, our deputy archivist, created an in-house database for us to track committee transfers of textual and electronic records. And this really is a continuation of the reports that the Center had been generating for us. But it also includes our electronic transfers. And the purpose of the reports that will be generated from this database at the end of the year is to share committee progress with archiving with the Senate Rules and Administration Committee. And these reports are transitional in form, pending implementation of the Archivists' Toolkit management system in our office. And you'll hear a little bit more about that later.

I wanted to tell you about the super committee, the Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction. And responsibility for archiving those records was assigned to the Senate by the joint committee rules. And we moved quickly to brief committee staff as the office was being set up last August and September. The committee closed down at the end of January. And we took possession of the records in order to arrange and describe them. The bulk of the collection is electronic. And access to the collection is divided between open and closed records. Open records include the Web source files, hearing videos, hearing transcripts, press files, letters from congressional committees, letters from individual members of Congress, letters from advocacy groups, letters from the general public, and Web forms filled out by the public for comment to the committee.

The remaining records are closed for 20 years. And these include staff files, staff working sessions, and legislative files. The joint committee Web site also was archived by the CyberCemetery archives at the University of North Texas. That site can be accessed at cybercemetery.unt.edu.

We continue to urge offices to assign archiving to a dedicated person in the office. And we urge offices to consider sending staff to the Modern Archives Institute. And we were fortunate for the January class that two senators sent staff and for the June class one committee, one of the committees that is not participating with the digital archiving, sent someone. So we have hopes that that large committee will follow with their digital archiving.

About 30 people have gone through the program, that's House and Senate, over the past eight or nine years. And so that's 30 more people that at least have a good idea now of what our goals are.

Eleven Senate offices are closing. And we have worked with the Sergeant at Arms staffs for over a decade with closing offices and providing guidance. But last year in 2011 we decided that we wanted to -- because of the electronic records there was so much more to cover--that we decided to pull out of that process largely and begin to schedule our own

meetings. And so we do have a very full closing an office notebook that prominently features H. Con. Res. 307 and contains things like a closing timeline and quick cards on topics ranging from selecting a repository and inventorying a collection to how to donate a collection. In this context H. Con. Res. 307 is proving to be an effective outreach tool to the senior staff, staff directors, and members. And another by-product is the notebook, which is rather large. Sometimes large things can have an effect just because of their size. But it's really to convince an office that it needs to direct some resources into the proper closing. And so all of our currently closing offices have either hired professional archivists or have brought in staff who are dedicated to the closing. So we're very comfortable about what's going on with closing offices.

ERICKSON: Karen, how many of the closing offices--how many of the members have already designated a repository?

PAUL: About half. But the others are just looking at options. So we think most of them will be going to a repository.

ERICKSON: Good.

PAUL: Yes it is. The Secretary has continued to host the brown bag luncheons. A recent brown bag was on the topic of what shall we save. Answers were presented by three different users of Senate collections; Dr. Richard Baker, Historian Emeritus of the Senate; Dr. Richard McCulley, political historian of the Center for Legislative Archives; and Ms. Jessie Kratz, political science specialist at the Center. It was Dr. Baker's first return visit to an archivist event since his retirement. And he said afterwards that he thought the meeting represented a flowering of the Archives. And so on that fragrant note!

ERICKSON: Great. Thank you, Karen. Robin.

REEDER: Thank you, Nancy. The Office of Art and Archives hosted its annual committee records forum back in March. And it was very well attended. We had 40 staff from nearly every committee represented who attended the meeting. We distributed copies of our new records management publications. And we spoke about the importance of archiving. Staff from the Center for Legislative Archives also participated and stressed the importance of proper records management.

Alison Trulock on our staff is serving as our project manager on the next-generation finding aid. And she's using Archivists' Toolkit to track accessions of records from the committees since this is the portion of the Next-Generation Finding Aid Task Force report that we have been focusing on. We've also been working closely with the Center

for Legislative Archives to refine and improve our accessioning process in order to better provide the information needed to fulfill the recommendations in the next-generation finding aid report.

Heather Bourk on our staff continues to deal with the vast amounts of photographs that are in the Office of Art and Archives, the House collection and the Historian's Office. Many of these photos will be up on the new Web site which will premiere sometime in the fall. And Heather is also assisting the Historian's Office with photo research for "Hispanic Americans in Congress."

We are gearing up for the end of the 112th Congress, receiving a lot of committee records and doing member consultations for departing members. And we're also participating with the Chief Administrative Officer's closing transition briefings that they are hosting. And they'll be doing the meetings up through November.

Here's just some brief statistics on what we've been doing since the last advisory committee meeting. We've had 29 member consultations, five committee consultations. Committee records and office records that have been transferred through us consist of 307,500 pages. We've loaned to committees a total of 34,450 pages. There have been 860 empty boxes going out, which will house 645,000 pages that'll be coming back to us. The curatorial staff at the Office of Art and Archives has installed an exhibit of Capitol souvenirs that's in the rotunda of the Cannon Building. So if you have some time you should stop by and see it. It's a quick report, but those are our activities.

ERICKSON: Karen and I were talking last week about the closing of offices. And it was an eye-opener for me to realize the burden that this must place on Robin and her staff. House members shortly after the election vacate their offices and members are given a terminal in a large room and without any staff. So I can imagine that that puts a lot of pressure on your staff in getting members' records moved to their respective repositories and to the Center for Legislative Archives. So good luck.

HUNT: I would just add that we do some missionary work on that front. On our very popular legislative vault tours we have the cards of Karen and Robin on site. So if Members show any interest in their papers, we make sure that they know they need to speak to the House and Senate archivists.

FERRIERO: Can I just comment on Karen's report about the disconnect between the IT and the records people? It's a common problem within the agencies that IT folks don't have any kind of relationship with the records managers in the same agency. And in fact shortly after I arrived Vivek Kundra and I brought together those two groups, the CIO

group and the records managers, for the first time. And it was about 200 people in this huge room and it was hysterical to walk into the room and see all the IT folks sitting on one side of the room and the records managers on the other. And at that meeting many of those people met for the first time from the same agencies. So it's a huge problem.

PAUL: When I was busy contacting committees involved with the orphaned accounts there were a couple times when they said, what are you talking about? They didn't even know that these things existed.

ERICKSON: Any other members have questions for Karen or Robin on their reports?
Comments?

VOGT: I wanted to ask, do you have Archivists' Toolkit yet for the Senate.

PAUL: We do, yes.

VOGT: So you're using that as well. All three of you now have that?

HUNT: We will.

VOGT: That's right, you will.

ERICKSON: As of today. All right. Next on our agenda is a discussion of the draft fifth report of the Advisory Committee. Karen, Richard and Robin will lead that discussion.

PAUL: So I'll start us off. This report is compiled every six years. And it is the responsibility of the current chair, whoever is chair, House or Senate, to oversee the production of the report. So to determine basic content I reread the minutes for the past five and a half years. The last report was published in December 2006. And the purpose was to identify major themes for the current report. And then Robin, Richard and I met to review the thematic categories and fix our assignments. So you have received a first draft of our efforts. Rereading it over the weekend, I realized there probably needs to be a little reordering of some of the subparagraphs and so on. And of course we need to do an executive summary.

So I would like us to begin to go through section by section and ask you to offer comments. Please keep in mind that the report is important in two ways. First it summarizes where we have been. But really more importantly it sets a direction for the next six years. And so it will be helpful if you'll think about and comment on the contents of the report. Did we leave anything out? Is there anything not clear? Do you

have any questions or observations? Secondly trends and issues that you feel should be highlighted in the executive summary. And thirdly any challenges you note. Comments about direction of projects, resources, issues needing attention. And of course you may want to continue to think about these after today's meeting. And if you do please share your comments with us as soon as you care to.

So following the meeting then we'll take the comments, fine-tune the report and do a draft executive summary. And of course we'll have a final report for the December meeting. So if we can begin by asking for comments for section one.

WASNIEWSKI: Just a question about your timetable. When are you going to finalize the report?

PAUL: We're looking at September. So are there any comments? Should we go by section? Section 1A, I don't think there's terribly much to be said about that. It's something we're really pleased about.

ERICKSON: Could we add that David was a breath of fresh air on the archiving front?

PAUL: I do think we need to add something about this is something that we dreamt about for a long time. We do need to put a punch line in there, yeah, OK. Robin, would you like to lead the discussion on Section 1B, outreach in the House?

REEDER: Sure. We really wanted to highlight how much our outreach has changed and grown in the last six years. And talking about the yearly committee records forums. We've always had the forums but usually we had just focused on the majority staff and letters just went to the committee chairs. But now letters go to the committee chairs, the subcommittee chairs, and the ranking members in both the full committees and the subcommittees. And it's really helped because it seemed that a lot of times the records messages weren't getting relayed to the other committee staff. So we've been really upping our game on that. And we've also been meeting individually with the committees. The forum is a great resource, but it really has been helpful to just meet individually with the committees because I think they feel more comfortable in talking about their own issues more in a private setting. And it's been very helpful too. And of course our new committee publications have been well received and we're making sure that people know where they are on our Web site when they can get hard copies.

ERICKSON: Robin, do you mind for the folks who don't have a copy of the draft report? I was fascinated by the story in your report about the letters that President Nixon had sent

to the House Judiciary Committee that ended up in private hands. Do you mind just briefly? Talk about that.

REEDER: Oh absolutely. We had learned -- actually it was through the Archives -- that there were two letters that were going to be auctioned. They were in a manuscript dealer's hands. They were two letters from Richard Nixon basically saying to Peter Rodino, Judiciary Committee chairman, why he wasn't going to turn over his tapes. And so in looking at these letters, they really were committee records. So we did a lot of detective work trying to figure out what happened. And it turned out that they had originally been in Peter Rodino's personal papers at Seton Hall University. And through our attorneys and through the Archives' attorneys we were able to put some pressure on the manuscript dealer to do the right thing. And the client was never revealed. So we had to work through the manuscript dealer. But fortunately they did the right thing and they did turn them back over. And then on top of that there were a lot of committee records in Peter Rodino's records at Seton Hall that had been transferred over, and we received all those back as well.

HUNT: The origins of that story started with a phone call that an archivist never wants to receive. And that is from a dealer who says, how do you differentiate personal papers from official records? Not an answer you want to give over the phone, because you know what they're looking for. And so that was when we began discussions with them to narrow down what we thought the records were and then brought it to the Clerk's attention. It became pretty clear they were not in the House impeachment inquiry committee records. So we backtracked.

ERICKSON: Fitting victory on the 40th anniversary of Watergate that we're celebrating this year.

FERRIERO: Do we have any data, either House or Senate, of the increase in assignment of archivists to committees over time? Many of the committees now have professionals from the very beginning, which is a great model. And is that something that is increasing or stable?

PAUL: It increased over the past six years but has reached a plateau because of the budget.

FERRIERO: I think it would be important to highlight that because it's a positive trend, and we want to reinforce it.

BIRDWHISTELL: I have a question. I'm not sure if it's in the proper order. I have a question for you. It seems that your amount of papers continues to rise but it's slow.

And so I'm wondering what's this doing to your record schedule, your ability to tell what's coming in and what shouldn't be coming in. And on top of that is there duplication in the large amounts of electronic records that you're now capturing with the paper documents that are still coming in? And how do you handle that?

HUNT: Paper is continuing to grow in volume. There might be a slight diminution but I still think it's on an upward trend, which is again surprising. As I pointed out before, for the legislative branch commissions it's the reverse, 95% of the records are electronic and about 5% are paper. We don't get anything we're not supposed to get, because the House and Senate archivists are actually the appraisers and the records managers. So we're receiving permanent records mostly.

BIRDWHISTELL: In our situation when you're doing data curation it's usually just take everything and then pick it out of there rather than pick it out on the way in of these large heaps.

PAUL: We're required to do some processing on the digital before it's sent. I know we do look at it pretty closely. And we really need to be able to describe it well enough that we can find the stuff.

BIRDWHISTELL: My questions revolve around this transition. Everybody thinks you can turn a light switch and everything goes the other way. And I think this is one of the difficult periods.

PAUL: It is. And there really isn't a lot of overlap between paper and digital at all. No. I would say the ballgame is in the digital almost exclusively. And really what this actual processing has allowed us to see is really I think a change in the way even legislation is processed now from say six years ago. It's really fascinating because we read in the paper a gang of six or a gang of 12, a gang of this and that. And so in the digital we're seeing that even the committee structure isn't necessarily adhered to in terms of processing legislation. That it can be members and staff coming together just because they have common interests. And so you're as apt to see information outside of a committee's jurisdiction in those committee archived files as you will within that. So really it has changed I think in six years. The world has changed. Record keeping and also the way people are processing legislation has really changed.

RITCHIE: Could I add in here that the one nice thing about doing a six-year report is to see how much you've done in that time period? And clearly six years ago there was a problem on the horizon that people could see which was electronic records. And what this report documents is how the archivists in the Senate and House really anticipated that

and adjusted to it. And I think it's a real tribute to Karen and Robin and their staffs that they've gotten so much done and they're really dealing with these problems as they're coming up. So it's not an unmanageable situation right now. It's difficult but not unmanageable.

PAUL: The next is transitioning to digital records in the Senate. And I think it's something that we're not totally over the hump. We're still struggling with some of the committees. But we are past the halfway point. Which does make it a little easier, because the more who are doing it, obviously those who are not begin to look a little old-fashioned I guess. So we're hoping to convince all of the committees to begin to do this. And just another observation. Thinking of six years ago, there was a question in my mind as to the role of an archivist in a digital office. And I think maybe other archivists have had that thought as to really what role we would play in a new environment. Sheryl, does that ring a bell with you? But I really come to see that the archival role is even, I think, more enhanced in the digital environment. That it's really more important to have a historical archival presence as new systems are brought in and as old systems become defunct. And the archivist really does become the glue that holds the historical thread together in an office.

VOGT: I agree.

HUNT: I would just note the major shift and transformation for us is that we're more involved in the front end than we ever were on paper. And that they understand that how we preserve and provide access to these records is essential to how they're created and transferred to us. And so it was easy for people to blindly put paper in boxes and send them to us. But we don't have that luxury with electronic records. So we've worked through the invitation of the archivists, and we've had a lot more meetings and contact with committees. And I think that's really essential to success.

FERRIERO: But once more it points up the importance of the relationship with the IT folks. And is there some way we can capture that in this report?

PAUL: Yes absolutely. That absolutely needs to happen.

FERRIERO: They're off building new systems or shutting off your electronic mail. They need better information.

THOMAS: I've got one question along that line for the three of you. Just general. Is turnover within the staffs of either House committees or Senate committees, has that been a problem within the last six years? Or does that create a gap at times?

PAUL: Very much so. I was just counting. I sent out a memo two weeks ago to the staff directors. And let's see. It was 17 committees. I haven't figured out the percentage. But eight bounced back. And that was since January when I put the list together. And those are top level positions. Staff directors changing. So it is a problem. And it's particularly a problem with digital because the staff director has to approve this activity in many instances. And once we've gotten that approval we tend to run on it through subsequent changeovers. But getting that initial approval is a really really difficult decision for them to make. And it takes a while to work with people on that question. And if they're suddenly not there, well, we have to start again. So it is a real problem, staff turnover, yeah.

THOMAS: So has the availability of an archivist on these committees helped in that transition?

PAUL: It makes the world of difference, it does.

THOMAS: I think that might be a point to make also. Along with the number of archivists that have been on staff. That the archivists help and smooth over these transition periods.

ERICKSON: Karen, we may also want to note too the growth in the number of archivists in personal offices. Because I think if a senator has an archivist on his or her personal staff, there may be increased sensitivity with having that same position on a committee.

PAUL: I don't think the number of professional archivists has risen. It always seems to hover around six to eight of the total. And of course that six to eight changes. But they tend to be hired when retirement is announced. And so right now we have a lot of them. But we're not going to have them all in January. But that is a problem because really -- and although we keep mentioning this, they really need to do this sooner rather than waiting till retirement for obvious reasons. Because then it's a little late. Can be too late in terms of these things. But I did mention, of the offices that are closing, they've all got dedicated people. And some of them have had people for a long time. So we need to probably work more with staff directors in the senators' offices in that regard.

REEDER: We've had some good luck on the House side with the members that are leaving in contracting a couple of the local companies that do archival outreach. And I know that the Senate has done this for a while. But it really has been great. And they're talking to each other too. So I know there are three members who are leaving on a hall and they've all contracted with History Associates as well.

PAUL: So now we're ready to move on to the policy committees and party conferences. And so from the report it seems like it's more of a Senate issue than a House issue. But we do regard all policy committees to be committees of the Senate as opposed to records of the member. And we have made overtures and continue to make overtures to the policy committees. The Democratic committee is a frequent user, especially for its video collection, of the Archives. The Republican Policy Committee is an infrequent user. And again in looking forward I do think the report really needs to emphasize the importance of those records, because they really are in terms of importance among the most important records of the Senate. And we would like to see both of the committees - - really love to see them hire an archivist obviously. And because I know they both have backlogs. Even of paper records. And are not doing too much with the digital at this point. So that is a big area for us.

And we'll move on to classified records. The report mentions the fact that the Congress receives tons literally of classified records in a year. And within the past year we have really tried to focus on appraisal of these records in a better way and have put out some guidance. And all of these things require of course a lot of negotiations and providing answers about who's going to do what and where will we find the staff to do all this. But we think we're making progress. And we'll continue to strengthen our outreach. And again within the Senate environment it's going to mean outreach to every person who has a security clearance and who acts as a security manager. So in terms of outreach it is another big task to begin to get these records appraised before they're sent to the Archives. And to really stop piling onto the Archives things that will never get declassified and no one will ever really know that they're there.

And I think we have a recent initiative with the Foreign Relations Committee transcripts that we're about to undertake for declassification. So that'll be coming up. And of all of the records what we have focused on as being most important are the notes that staff take during classified briefings, those being the only records that document what was said in these briefings. So we've worked with our Security Office to ensure that those records are retained and are being sent to the Archives.

RITCHIE: This is a matter of eternal vigilance. And Karen should be commended on this as well because actually on the other side of this wall here is the Senate Security Office. And there's a room that they call the burn room. And Karen and I went down to take a look at it one day. It's full of bags of things that are literally going to be burned. And Karen said well, much of it is duplicate copies. Ten copies of the same classified report, things like that, that they can't possibly save and they don't need to save. But Karen identified the staff notes as being really important to save, and really encouraged that office to consider that and to get the word out to the different security people in the

different committees on this as well. So it's just a tiny percentage, less than 1% probably, of what's destroyed, is valuable and worthwhile keeping. But you've got to put that on the radar, otherwise it's going to be burned with everything else.

VOGT: I think that something that should be emphasized as well, is the need for resources in this area because it's not only affecting Karen's office but also the Center to have resources for declassification. I think it will be extremely important in the coming years to take care of that. And I notice that you also have not received guidance from those from whom you were asking guidance. And I guess that's just part of your vigilance as well to try to keep going back and get that.

PAUL: Yes. Sheryl is referring to the Senate Intelligence Committee's request for guidance on declassification to DOD. And again because of the huge backlogs -- and I think we had a report from Kris Wilhelm on Richard's staff recently about a 44-page report -- and I don't recall the committee -- that someone had requested. And we were told that it was going to take two and a half years to get that declassified. So we're really talking about a huge backlog in the executive branch with processing the declassification. So it's obvious given that DOD isn't going to respond very quickly to the Intelligence Committee's request. It's going to take a while. And again the budget crisis severely impacted, because Don and I had worked with the committee to discuss declassification of the Church Committee records and that's 145 archive boxes. So you can multiply the number of pages. I don't know. But anyway so that's 145 archive boxes and that came in at \$4 million estimate to declassify those boxes. So that was scheduled to be an earmark in DOD in Fiscal '11 and that appropriation bill was not passed. And so that died at that point. And so that's why the committee went back to ask for guidance, including the Church Committee records, but it's just not a top priority in the larger universe of budgetary demands I guess at the moment.

VOGT: I think it's going to become a larger demand for you guys because once the Next-Generation Finding Aids Project is up and these materials are known about, then people are going to really be looking for declassified materials as well.

PAUL: Yeah it is a growing, growing problem, absolutely. So we're at 1E. And I did report on that. The Joint Select Committee on Deficit Reduction. And so the good news is that material is archived. And I think it is somewhat of a model for us in dealing with the legislative commissions issue, because of the way we were able to work with the committee as they were setting up. And so we avoided a lot of issues about electronic e-mail and everything else. Because that was the ground rules as we set up. And so that actually went very smoothly and quickly. And the next is the Appropriations Committee

ledgers. And we remember that story. So I'm going to turn it over to Richard now for accessions and loans.

HUNT: Thank you very much. These sections report on our activities and our intersection with the accessioning activity and description in the House and Senate. You can see we continue to grow both in the amount of records and the record services we provide to the House and Senate through loans. We are bringing together our accessioning, processing, and descriptive procedures. Much of the roadmap for this was laid out in the next-generation finding aids report authored by Sharon Leon. And we've used that guide as a sure-handed way to move forward. It's really made it a lot more streamlined. We've been able to basically make everything electronic and captured in databases as opposed to paper systems. So I feel like we have good control over these processes now. Questions or points of emphasis you'd like to see?

LEON: I wonder if it might be possible for us to think about inserting something as both Karen and Robin reach out to members, committees, and increasingly you have archivists in members' offices. If we might be able to emphasize the need for them to also experience some concentrated training in digital archiving and those standards in hopes that maybe we can continue to push this progress further and further to the point of creation.

PAUL: Good point. And I think we're fortunate that Richard now has a full IT staff again. Because we went almost a year without that. And so we're really looking forward to begin to work as a team again with his staff on that.

HUNT: Jacqie will report in more detail, but look at the numbers here. We've done over 8,000 new descriptions following the rubric of this more granular description. In the previous 20 years we'd done about 1,500 descriptions total. So in the last year and a half we've done that many times over. So with current staffing we still predict in about five and a half years we'll be able to have everything described.

PAUL: So you have the Holdings Management System up and running now and that took a long while to get that pulled together.

HUNT: Yeah, that was the transition from an in-house database to an agency system that has full support and network capabilities. So all the information is captured in that system.

PAUL: Moving toward barcoding with that also.

HUNT: Yes we're starting to do barcoding of loans.

PAUL: We'll be catching up to Sheryl. I don't think we need to go into the Finding Aids Project. That was pretty well documented in the reports recently. And for an update perhaps we'll ask Jacqie to come forward. Jacqie Ferry. And talk about the Descriptive Tool Task Force part of this.

FERRY: I believe it was before our last Advisory Committee meeting in December, when a Descriptive Tool Task Force was suggested.

ERICKSON: Jacqie, do you mind speaking into the mike?

PAUL: And let me introduce Jacqie. A fairly new hire to Richard's staff. And you've been there a year?

FERRY: Ten months.

PAUL: Ten months. Yes. But she really has hit the ground running. Jacqie.

FERRY: Thanks. So the Descriptive Tool Task Force started in the winter. And it's comprised of ten members. Karen, Elisabeth and Alison from the Senate are on the task force as well as Robin, Heather and Alison from the House. And Alison is taking the lead on the House end for that. And Alison and Elisabeth are taking the lead on the Senate side. And then from the Center we have myself. And I've been trying to corral this group through this process. And the Center's Matt Fulgham, Kate Mollan and Tom Eisinger also are members. The task force has met, the whole group has met, about a half dozen times. And there's been smaller subgroups that have formed working on House-specific issues and Senate-specific issues. And I would say all in all we've probably met about 20 times since last late November. So we've been working away on setting the foundation for implementing Archivists' Toolkit. I was going to talk more about it in my report, but if you want I can talk more about what the task force has done.

PAUL: No, I think that brought us up to date.

FERRY: Thanks.

PAUL: OK. Richard, are we ready to move on to J, the legislative commissions? Did you want to say anything about that at this point? There will be a report later on it.

HUNT: No, you did a wonderful summary of the situation as reported and what we've been living with.

PAUL: The summary is fine. OK.

FERRIERO: Can I just ask a question about projections on descriptions? So according to what I read, by adding one staff person we've cut the projection in half.

HUNT: Yes, from ten to five years,

FERRIERO: If we add more, would that make it two and a half?

FERRY: It would be a little bit more than that I would think. I don't have those numbers with me. But we projected it based on our experience with the pilot projects.

HUNT: About three years, I believe.

FERRY: Yes. We did a chart I think before the last Advisory Committee meeting that I could provide that I don't have with me today that was based upon the number of staff members. But part of it is that there's existing staff that are spending-variant. And that time is a little bit fluid depending on other projects. So it's a range. But yes, I think we'd be closer to three if we added another person.

PAUL: So that's two more, not one more. You're talking about two more.

HUNT: No. We have one. Adam Berenbak has just been added as a new description archivist so that's one. An extra one would put it down to about three years.

PAUL: Oh so it would be one more.

FERRIERO: Couldn't you work faster?

HUNT: The section on legislative branch commissions is simply a summary. We've been talking about it for the past few meetings. And we really delved into it more deeply last time. Just the impact that it's having on us and our resources, which are fairly limited and dedicated to other important projects. We see our major mission as servicing the House and Senate and their records and the scholarly community using those records. And it was just the circumstances of the way commissions are created, that leave a lot of open-ended questions by the time the legislation is done. The commissions hit the ground running, they have a lot of important business to do. And then at the 11th hour, using a variety of methods they pick an access period, and they're done at that point, and it falls on our shoulders. And there have been members of Congress and public interest

groups that have questioned some of those decisions, whether they're too long or too short. And then it falls on the new owner of these records, the Archivist of the United States. So it just is leading to an untenable set of circumstances and situations. And our challenge was: is there some way that this committee or the House and the Senate can find a way to some solution that might straighten this out a bit?

PAUL: We're ready to move on to Section 2. And I think we've already commented quite a bit about outreach to members. But Robin, do you want to tell us a little bit about H. Con. Res. 307? Just for those people who weren't here during that historic moment?

REEDER: Well, Karen Paul had some draft language for a resolution because our concern was that even though members' papers are considered their personal property we felt like some of them weren't maybe looking at a repository towards the end of their service for their papers. And so the draft language that Karen had really helped them urge that there be a sense that they consider their papers to be an important legacy and to place and to preserve them properly and to find a repository for them. So after Karen gave me the language we vetted it, sent it up to then Clerk Lorraine Miller and it moved pretty quickly actually. And next thing we knew the chairman of House Administration, Chairman Brady, pushed it through. And it went pretty quickly back in 2008. And so it's really nice to have a copy of it that we give to members when we're talking to them. That way they can see that even though it's not a requirement that it's a strong sense of Congress. And I think it's been helpful to both of us in urging members to properly care for their papers and to find a repository.

THOMAS: If I could just interject here on behalf of places around the country who accept congressional papers. I think a note of thanks is in order for your work in getting this passed. It has become a very good tool for us to use when we are approaching members of Congress about their papers. So I'd just like to interject a thank you here.

PAUL: That's really good to hear because when the committee was discussing it there were questions raised as to how we would use it and would it have an impact. So that's nice to hear. So we're into the outreach to members. And we've given some detail of our experience with closing the offices of Senators Obama and Biden. And that occurred of course after the '08 election. But for the archivists in the Senate, it provided a good first hands-on opportunity to work with members' papers because we are tasked with archiving the committee records. This instance allowed us to really go in and assess the difficulties in closing an office firsthand. And that as the report shows resulted in production of some quick cards. And we've mentioned quick cards throughout the report. Essentially the quick cards again are designed to raise the archival awareness, and the historical awareness, of everybody who works in Congress. They are not designed

with archivists in mind per se. But they are designed so that every staff person will have some sense of the records they're creating simply because of where they work. They work in Congress. And the quick card idea came out of the IT education and training folks. It was really that's how they train people in new systems really quickly. So we've adapted that as a training tool for the archivists in the historical programs.

THOMAS: Karen, just one thought. On the final draft of this report those perhaps could be an appendix inserted in the back.

PAUL: Appendix of quick cards. And I know Robin and I have been doing a lot more outreach to staff. As Robin mentioned private meetings are sometimes more effective than large meetings. But to combine them I think is what we need to do. And I apologize for including this definition of an archivist in the report but I couldn't resist because it was the result of one of the Secretary's brown bags. And, one of the Judiciary Committee archivists put this together. So I thought that it should be preserved in the report. And I would like to comment that in 1982 when I was loaned to the Senate from the National Archives that archives and archivist was not a word that people really cared to banter about. It was a situation where archives was equated with retiring and loss of political power. And so I say that that's one really big change that we've seen happen since the Advisory Committee was established. And that is that archivist is now no longer a four-letter word.

ERICKSON: I think we've been fortunate in the Senate. And I see Nan Mosher here. But we are grateful for the leadership of Senator Reid and Senator McConnell who have full-time archivists on their staff. And that really has sent in my opinion a strong message as to the importance that leadership places on the role of archivists in Senate offices.

PAUL: Yes it really has.

ERICKSON: Karen, one other addition. And I'll defer to you on where this should be placed. But I couldn't help but think. Recently and in my appropriations testimony before Leg Branch when I was citing accomplishments I cited the fact that President Obama had recently issued an executive order to agencies about preserving, archiving their records. And it was with some gloating that I testified that the Senate was way ahead of the executive branch on this front, that we've been doing it for years and years and years. And we may want to make reference to that executive order in the report just for context purposes to show the history of our House and Senate efforts to archive records.

FERRIERO: I have a question about records managers versus archivists because there's language in here using both terms, and the folks who are now filling those slots. Are they professional archivists? Or are they records managers?

PAUL: They've all been trained. Some have been trained from the institute and others have degrees. So it's a mix.

FERRIERO: It's a mix.

PAUL: It's a mix, yes.

FERRIERO: One of the problems in the federal government is that there is no such thing as records manager. So we're working with OPM to create that family of records manager positions. And I'm just concerned that the language here capture the fact that we're talking about both functions.

PAUL: It actually does capture both. Yes it is a mix.

ZINK: And also the records manager is the application glue between those IT people and archivists.

FERRIERO: Exactly, exactly.

PAUL: Are we ready to move on to the gift tax issue? Has everyone had a chance to read that? The bottom line is we have put I think a substantial amount of thought and discussion into this but we really have concluded that the timing to really do anything on this issue is not here. It's not now. So I think this is an issue that we'll continue to be aware of. But I think in the Senate anyway we're moving beyond that. We did have an adverse impact four years ago with people not donating their collections to the level that we had hoped. But we seem to have put that behind us and working with our legal counsel's office are encouraging people to make deposits of collections. And I know this continues to be a problem for some repositories. But really that is where we are right now. And I think that successfully the collecting repositories are learning to accept part of a collection on gift. That part that can be opened immediately. And accepting the rest on a deposit. And that's just where we are at this point. So unless anyone has any ideas about how to move this forward, we're out of them is the bottom line. OK. So we're on Section 3, the CRI.

HUNT: I would say clearly if you look back over the six years as Nancy has noted, we were at a point in time when there were a lot of question marks as to how we were going to proceed and successfully preserve electronic records. And the Congressional Records Instance is probably the single greatest achievement we've had at the National Archives. It hasn't been an easy achievement. It's taken the support of a number of people including this current Archivist. But we've gone from the transitional phase where we set up an initial system at a very low cost but with some risk on preservation and backup copies where we now have a new system that has its own tape backup system. And there's a long term deep preservation system at Rocket Center. So we're ready to do business and take the electronic records that you're providing to us; we're in good shape. Any questions or comments?

THOMAS: One. First off, looking back at this whole report, I think it really reflects the work that has been going on in the past six years. And six years ago electronic records was oh my gosh this big thing we're going to all have to deal with. So the work that has been done has been tremendous. And I commend you for that. I think also though that we have to look beyond the preservation aspect of these records. And that would be the next step and that is access. Public access to them. I know most of these are going to be closed for 20, 30 years. But things coming in in the '90s will be open fairly quickly, before we know it. So I would just suggest or highly recommend that some thinking be given to how the public is going to access these. It creates a problem. Public getting access to authentic records but then also protecting the integrity of the originals. So there is a lot of issues to work out there. So not to put more on your plate, Richard.

HUNT: No, that's fine. That's where we're headed. Brandon, do you have any brief thoughts you'd like to share on that front?

HIRSCH: I think that's an excellent point. Especially on the 20-year records that will be coming up very soon. Something we're certainly giving thought to. Now that we have our new CRI system up and operational our focus is increasingly going to be on that.

FERRIERO: That's part of larger access to records in general that the Electronic Records Archives is building. Our Online Public Access tool that we're using for the rest of the records should do that for these records.

LEON: Just a quick question. We've talked a lot today about the growing shift in tide from paper to electronic, which for years and years you've been dealing with. I have a question about ongoing capacity issues and how to stress the importance of the need for ongoing capacity. What is the situation with ongoing storage capacity?

FERRIERO: Cloud. We've already moved to the cloud.

LEON: Great.

BIRDWHISTELL: I have a follow-up question to that with regards to the long term storage and what's going on nationally and the Archives as an ARL participant and the movements nationally with the DPN--the Digital Preservation Network. I'm curious, as a government agency how we're tying into these national attempts to provide backup that's repeated and also adapts to the different types of technology over a long period of time. Is the Archives getting involved in that?

FERRIERO: We're actually involved internationally in the development of tools that can recognize, translate and migrate files over time. So we've had some success with an IBM software package called EBCDIC which was extensively used by NASA. It's unreadable. There aren't any EBCDIC people anymore. And we've been working with this international consortium to develop the translation program to be able to read that and migrate that over time. We have also developed a priority list of the most at risk technologies so that we can work with this group to make sure that we've got the capacity to translate.

BIRDWHISTELL: That's one of our big challenges.

FERRIERO: Yes of course.

PAUL: And we're now up to Web harvest. Will there be a Web harvest this year?

HUNT: There is a contract in place. We will harvest at the end of this Congress.

PAUL: All right. I think we've had some comments raised about previous Web harvests. So Brandon, I think we will need to talk about that further. So are we ready to move to collaborations as the next? I think this is very self-explanatory and really portrays in a very detailed way the growth and development of the Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists and the role that the roundtable has played over the years with the Advisory Committee. Picking up certain tasks that the Advisory Committee has asked the roundtable to do. And it's just been a really nice symbiotic relationship. And then more recently a third partner joined the dance. And that is the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, which Sheryl Vogt has been a very strong president of that for the past two years. I think one of the wonderful things that the ACSC has been able to do, something that the Advisory Committee really isn't in a

position to do, and that is to address funding issues. Sheryl, maybe you'd like to speak about that. ACSC has created scholarships and also found funds for public outreach.

VOGT: Yes we have three scholarship -- or three awards that we make each year. One is for a research travel grant for students to use materials in congressional repositories. And another is to bring staff to an annual meeting of the ACSC. One is named for Ray Smock and one is named for Richard Baker. And then we have just in this last year done a scholarship for CPR, which is Congressional Papers Roundtable. And that is for a member of that group to attend the preconference workshop that CPR offers every year at SAA. And that's really one of the places that beginning congressional archivists get their foot in. And it's really good to support them. We're very glad we can do that. I'd like to say also that in this last year we have had donations of \$3,000 to our awards program and that shows just how much our organization, our membership is saying that this is really an important thing that we're doing. So as you get to the end of the year and you need to make donations we would be glad to have them for this awards program. Thank you.

PAUL: And so we're at the final section, which is overwhelmingly wonderful, the educational and professional outreach at the center. Rich. Superb.

HUNT: And the successes that we've achieved have relied upon the partnerships that we've formed over the last years. There is probably nothing more central than our exhibit work in the Capitol Visitor Center. That meant the opening of a world-class venue for us to take the great House and Senate treasures and put them on display for the American people. So that was a real signal achievement. And then on the public programs front, both the Former Members of Congress Association and the Bipartisan Policy Center headquartered here in Washington have really been just huge helps to us in reaching audiences on some of the great political, economic, and social issues. And we've had some very popular programs. And then on the educational front we've been working with Humanities Texas for about a decade now. And have been there four or five times each year and reached thousands of teachers in Texas. And we're very excited about the Lou Frey Institute and the Sandra Day O'Connor Teaching of Civics Act in Florida. And we're starting to get more active on that front as well. So we're reaching some critical audiences.

And now with our new organization we have a challenge to help the National Archives form a national education program of which we hope to be an important part. And teaching about Congress remains an important element of that as well.

PAUL: I think we're at the end, I think, of the report. Unless there's any further comments, observations. I would like to make one that's entered my mind recently and having

worked on the report. There is one area that I would like all of us to find a better way to communicate, and that's in the outreach to members category. I think the resolution is really important. But I would still, and I'm still looking for something that we can do together to reach out to members, especially when they first arrive or soon after they arrive. This is something that we do with the new members' offices in that. But I also think there have been so many wonderful panel discussions of retired members talking about their papers. And they're preaching to the choir really. And if there was some way we could think of using that accumulated wisdom, which we now have in transcripts and video and so on. But to use that in some way in orientation. I know it's difficult. But to really reach out to members so that they make sure their staff directors are assigning someone that task for managing those records. If we could think of something that would be wonderful.

FERRIERO: I'd like to reinforce that. And I know you do a good job when people are coming in. It's like remedial work that needs to be done. Robin knows this story. When I had my budget hearing before the House committee this year, we didn't talk about my budget at all. We talked about what should they be doing with their records. And these weren't new people. These were people who've been around for a while. So I turned their names over to Robin as soon as I got back to my office. We need to think of ways throughout their careers at least maybe even with the staff directors that we keep reinforcing this. That you have this expertise at your fingertips. Make use of it.

PAUL: It's true. We do need to work on it and maybe we need to come up with one or two ways. I don't think we can totally depend on staff directors either.

HAAS: Can I just add? I agree with all of your comments. But I do want to pay compliments to Robin and her team because since I've been back in this position I've noticed a real change in the House. Not only are they aggressive at the end when people are starting to close offices. But more importantly they're aggressive at the beginning. So they're out there. They are beating the bushes. We're getting the letters out. They're stopping by the offices and making visits. One thing we really need to look at is the follow-through to continue the process. So if we're there at the beginning and there at the end, what can we do along the way to continue to let them know we're there as a resource. And then also talk about the importance of all of this. So I agree with what you said. But I do want to say on behalf of the House I've seen a real improvement over there over the last several years with all the work that's being done. And Robin has letters on my desk immediately after a primary election. She's there ready to go. She wants to help. And we also are looking at updating the packets that we provide our members when they come in for orientation. We're revamping that packet. And as part

of it we're going to have information regarding the records in there. So that's one of the things that we're looking at.

REEDER: Thank you.

VOGT: I'd like to add a little bit to that as well. As one who's come to the Hill since the 1980s and made the rounds to all of our delegation to try to get in the door, I've really felt very much like the Fuller Brush Man trying to get my foot in. And then also coming back even after we have a commitment and there's been staff turnover, and they're like, who are you? And I say, don't you have a folder about the library and the commitment? No, we haven't seen anything like that. And just having to start all over again. But this, it's not just getting the resolution passed. It's also the work to reinforce, what you've said about the work that Robin and Karen have been doing. That they can get in much easier than they could back in the '80s. And that has made a tremendous difference for us as well. And I think we constantly reinforce each other in trying to support the work of each other because I know when I'm talking with someone in the beginning I will say have you talked with the Senate archivists, have you talked with the House archivists, they're there for you, there's a great resource, and I really encourage you to do that. And so I know that they're encouraging for the repositories as well. So that's been extremely helpful. It's really wonderful the strides we have made. But it's amazing. I think it's part of human nature that we have to keep going back with something like that.

FERRIERO: So there's the last section on social media. We talked about harvesting Web sites. What are we thinking about social media applications that are currently being used?

PAUL: Well, we have a couple of tools that we give out to all the offices to preserve what they can on that. So let's see. It's YouTube, Facebook and Twitter are the top three being used. And we certainly have some guidance that we share with them on that. And frequently they haven't thought of it.

HUNT: Those are members' papers? Do you see anything in the social media world that you would consider a committee record?

PAUL: We haven't seen too much of that in the committees, not as much as the members.

FERRIERO: I would expect it's going to raise its head. Just a heads up. We should be thinking about it.

LEON: We at the Center for History and New Media are in the midst of trying to put together a project about archiving social media. And we're got a real problem with terms of service

as our major hurdle. That the terms of service prevent outside entities from doing the archiving. You can archive your own. But even that's only for private use. It's going to be a problem.

FERRIERO: There's some interesting work that the Library of Congress is doing because they're the repository for Twitter. And they've had some interesting challenges because of the change in language of the contract over time. Twitter's contract. So they can only actually provide access to the first five years of data. But there's a lot of federal tweets in the first five years.

PAUL: I need to turn to Elisabeth and Alison to finally answer the question where are you about the tweets. We haven't seen any tweets, have we, from committees? I don't really think they're using that. Wil? No. Yes. It's not as much as the members are using social media, yes.

ERICKSON: So Karen, it's fair to say the goal remains to have a final draft ready in the fall.

PAUL: By September, yes.

ERICKSON: By September. That we'll distribute to the members for review before the next meeting.

PAUL: Say by mid September we'll say, yes.

ERICKSON: All right. Let's move, Jacqie, to an update on the Next-Generation Finding Aids Project.

FERRY: Thank you. Thanks for the opportunity to allow me to give you an update on the Center's work on the Next-Generation Finding Aid Project. First, I'm happy to report that in May the Center hired an additional description archivist, which has already been mentioned. Adam is in the back over there. I can't say how pleased I am that we were able to add another person to this team. And I'm even more pleased that it was Adam that was selected for the position. He's been on board officially for about a month now. And he's already proved to be very very helpful in a number of ways. Adam will be helping with the conversion of our preliminary inventories, which are our primary print finding aids. He'll also be working on modern records description and the modern committee record backlog that we've been chipping away at. And he'll also be helping with testing of Archivists' Toolkit. In addition to all of that Adam has already taken a

lead on making improvements to our researcher database. So he's been working with Brandon on that project.

Since the last meeting the Center has trained several student employees and interns to continue our effort to convert existing print preliminary inventories for committee records into ARC-compliant descriptions. ARC is the National Archives Archival Research Catalog. And that's our primary way to reach users. At the last meeting you'll recall that the Center had completed description of the first 50 Congresses and, as well as the 58th and 75th Congresses. In the past six months the Center has also completed conversion of the 51st through 56th Congresses. And this conversion process has resulted in 836 new record descriptions which will be submitted for inclusion in ARC. This brings the total number of record descriptions from the preliminary inventory conversion to just under 6,000 records. These descriptions are near folder-level description. So this is much more granular description than we had before. And this will be the first time that these descriptions are available online so researchers will no longer have to contact us or come in person in order to be able to have access to this really rich description.

The preliminary inventories cover the first 79 Congresses. So the center has 21 more Congresses left to convert. So with continued availability of student staff resources -- students have been doing most of this work -- we expect to be able to complete this work by the end of 2013. We should have a very good sense of how close we'll be to that at the end of the summer because we have a lot of student help this summer to work on this project.

Following the success of the 95th pilot project, which we reported on at the last Advisory Committee meeting, Center staff has applied those procedures to ongoing description of its modern committee record description backlog. Since the last Advisory Committee meeting, Center staff has reviewed description from the 95th Congress and has submitted it for inclusion in ARC.

In addition, in order to get those records into ARC, staff created 20 new series level descriptions. So that's a higher level description. And established 24 new organizational records. And we also updated dozens of other records based upon new descriptive information that we compiled during the 95th. Center staff has also completed description of records from the 93rd Congress. And these descriptions are currently under review. That work was just completed last week. During the 93rd Congress project Center staff spent a total of 365 staff hours describing the records. This resulted in more than 800 new description records covering over 4,400 cubic feet of material. And prior to the Next-Generation Finding Aids Project records from the 93rd Congress

and other modern Congresses were generally described at the series level. So this new description is going down to a much more granular level than we had before. So with this new more granular description created by Center staff there's, on average, a record describing every 5.5 cubic feet of records. So it's much more granular than before.

Adam has already begun work on the 94th Congress. And the rest of the staff will begin work on the 92nd Congress at our meeting tomorrow. With the addition of a second description archivist, Adam, we're on pace to eliminate the backlog of modern committee records description in approximately five to six years. So that's the number that Richard reported earlier.

Next I mentioned briefly a little bit about the Descriptive Tool Task Force. I'll go into a little bit more detail now. At the last Advisory Committee we had just formed the task force. And this task force was formed to guide the House, Senate and Center in a shared implementation of a collection management tool. Since then we've been busy laying the groundwork for implementation of Archivists' Toolkit, and eventually ArchivesSpace, which will be the successor to Archivists' Toolkit. Right now it's projected that that transition from Archivists' Toolkit to ArchivesSpace will happen at the end of 2013. Development has just started this summer. The task force is comprised, as I mentioned before, of the three Senate archivists, three House archivists, and four staff members from the Center. We met several times this past winter to establish goals for the task force. We then worked to identify stakeholders and develop use cases. And then we drafted proposed workflows.

After those initial meetings we decided to split the task force into smaller working groups. And these working groups have been mapping metadata between the existing transfer forms that are used by the House and Senate and also various systems. So we've been creating mappings between Archivists' Toolkit, HMS, which is the National Archives' location management database, and ARC, which is the National Archives' online access tool. And so this work will form the foundation of updating the existing House and Senate transfer forms and developing a shared implementation of Archivists' Toolkit. I was going to talk quite a bit about our efforts related to Archivists' Toolkit. But David has already given us the great news that our request, which we've been working so hard on over the last few months, has been approved. So I guess all I'll say related to that is all the great work that we've been doing with the Descriptive Tool Task Force is really just laying the groundwork that we'll need in order to implement that. And it's been a great group of people to work with. And I think everybody on that task force will agree that we've uncovered more issues and talked about more things than we ever thought that we would. And so it's been a really great experience.

Finally I'd like to mention a couple of upcoming activities just very quickly. In the next few months the National Archives will be replacing ARC with OPA which stands for Online Public Access. OPA offers several improvements including a better representation of the context and hierarchy of archival records. It also has an improved display of digitized content. And it includes several social tagging features. So if you haven't already checked out OPA I would highly recommend it.

OPA is expected to replace ARC this fall. And we've been working with Online Public Access staff to create improved links between the Center's Web site and OPA. We originally were looking at ways to improve links between the Web site and ARC. But we've decided with OPA coming on board in the fall it makes more sense to focus our efforts on the new system.

So one of the things we're planning to do is to create a customized search portal for congressional records on the Center's Web site. And the customized search portal will allow users to search records by Congress and by committee, which better reflects the way that congressional researchers request records. At the next Advisory Committee meeting we're hoping to demonstrate OPA and also to give you a preview of what this search portal might look like.

In addition to the change from ARC to OPA, the back end system to ARC will be replaced by a new system named DAS, which stands for, I believe, Description and Authority System. And that will happen in early 2013. The Center expects to benefit from several improvements with DAS, which includes a streamlined review process and also the ability to submit description records in XML format. Again you'll be hearing much more about both of these things in the coming months. But I wanted to share these with you now because they're really going to improve the ways that we can present online all of the description work that we've been doing.

RITCHIE: Jacqie, could I add that whenever the Center has a milestone -- and there seems to be a lot of them in this field -- it'd be good to put out announcements. Because the researchers are often in the dark as to what's happening. And no matter how often you announce these things, it's never enough for them. You have to keep doing it. And now whenever we do anything in the Senate Historical Office, we have about 20 different H lists that we put out notices on. And we find that's a pretty effective way of reaching historians and political scientists and other people who are in this field. So you've got a lot of good things to announce. And hope that whenever anything is more available to the researchers that they know about it as soon as possible.

FERRY: That's a good point. We've had preliminary conversations, Richard Hunt and Richard McCulley and I, about different ways that we might be able to advertise some of this work. So I think we're close to being able to put out a few blasts.

HUNT: There's less available online than we would like. So we're looking for that critical mass. But we agree with you wholeheartedly.

FERRY: It's also difficult with this transition from ARC to OPA because OPA right now, I don't know if it's in beta mode, but it doesn't have all of our record description in it. Because the amount of records that are in OPA is a lot less than what's in ARC. So we would ideally like to point people towards OPA since it's a much improved system and it will be the main system come fall, but most of the description we've done in the last six months isn't yet available in OPA. So we're waiting for some of those records to make it into OPA. And then there will be a really big push to send researchers there.

PAUL: I'd just like to say thank you to the members of your team because the work really has been excruciatingly detailed. And, it has been done with great joy. We really appreciate that.

FERRY: Thank you.

LEON: It is nice to see things are going so well.

ERICKSON: And this is another subject. I remember Dick Baker lamenting. He raised this issue several years ago about the importance of finding aids. And so I know that he'll be very proud when he learns of all your work, Jacqie. Keep it up. Next. Just briefly we'll report to you on the Senate research that we've done with respect to the issue that was raised at the last meeting on legislative commissions. I sent letters to the Senate Parliamentarian, the Senate Legislative Counsel, which is responsible for drafting legislation for members and committees, as well as Senate Legal Counsel to get their input on the issue. Senate Legislative Counsel provided us draft language that deals with access issues with respect to records. They didn't feel confident at this juncture adding language with respect to screening. And Senate Legal Counsel noted that the issue related to records is one of many issues that are problems when legislative commissions are created. And some examples that he mentioned were the location of a government structure, ethics matters, subpoena procedures, the agency responsible for administrative support such as payroll, gift acceptance authority, employee rights, to name just a few. And so Senate Legal Counsel thought it would be helpful for us to develop a checklist or

template that could be created when Congress establishes a legislative commission that we could hopefully address some of these issues. Don, do you have anything to add?

RITCHIE: No. I think they just pointed out to us that it was a big issue and that everybody has a stake in it. And that they actually have good ideas about it that will play into this. And our part of it is an important part for the Center. But if we're going to open that door we might as well address all these other issues as well.

ERICKSON: Robin, I know your folks also have been doing research and have been working on draft legislation -- or draft language for future statutes.

HAAS: I can speak to that, Nancy, if I could. The work in the House actually mirrors the work that you've been doing in the Senate. We've had some very successful conversations with the House Parliamentarians and worked with the Office of Leg Counsel. And I know that our counsels have been in touch. And I think we agree that there needs to be more of a comprehensive approach in this area. As I mentioned at our last meeting from my previous work I know this has been a longtime frustration just in the creation of these boards and commissions in that there couldn't be more of a template. And so some of these issues that have been raised with this committee I think would really be helpful that we address it in a comprehensive manner. So thank you for the work that you all have done.

ERICKSON: So hopefully at the next meeting we'll have something, a template to report to all of you. I want to add. She's not on the agenda, but I wanted Sheryl to talk briefly to give a report on the ACSC meetings.

VOGT: OK. I'll make it very brief. As many of you know, this year the group met at the Russell Library in Athens, Georgia at our new building. And as I told them, I said this is on my bucket list to have you here. So I was very glad to have the group there. And I think everyone enjoyed themselves. We met in connection with the Congress and History Conference which are political scientists. And so we had many opportunities to get together socially. And also we put together a program for them one afternoon that had to do with how to access our collections and also the content of our collections. So we're very glad to do that. They were also there for the former members of Congress session. And they seemed to really enjoy that. We had Mr. Lancaster. And I'm sorry, I can't remember his first name. And also Matt McHugh there for that session. So it was very very good.

The one thing I do want to tell you about is that this is something we've had in the works for several years. It was actually spearheaded by Betsy Pittman, who is a congressional

archivist at the Dodd Center at the University of Connecticut. And that was to put together a finding aids database that we would have all of our congressional holdings in. So she has done a test database with EAD records from about five of our member institutions. And it works. It was very exciting to see. And she's been working with her IT people at the University of Connecticut. So now we're looking at getting a grant for this, that Betsy will be getting the grant. And whether ACSC is going to host the Web site and manage the grant, those are things we have to decide. But this is something we're all very much excited about. And that Richard's records will be there with our records too. And we can talk to each other electronically. So that's really the highlight of that.

I do want to say that -- just because I think you would be interested in knowing -- that the person who was awarded the Baker Travel Grant this year for student research is Paige Welch, who's a PhD candidate at Duke University. And her research project is Right of Way: the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and National Identity in the 1970s. So I think that gives you a good idea of the kinds of research that people are trying to do, the topics that they have. And she will be going to the Alaska and Polar Regions collections at the University of Alaska, Fairbanks. Thank you.

HUNT: It's a magnificent facility, I have to say. And when I heard that it had somewhere in the range of 250,000 cubic feet of record storage I said I want two.

FERRIERO: I'll meet you at GSA.

PAUL: You're going to have to dig out the basement.

ERICKSON: Anyone else have any other issues to discuss before we adjourn? All right. Well, I want to thank everyone for your participation today. We've had a good discussion and I believe that we'll convene again in December, at the end of the year. So do I have a motion to adjourn?

M: So moved.

ERICKSON: All right. We are adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05.