

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS  
MEETING #44  
JUNE 24, 2013  
CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER  
SVC 212-10

Members of the Committee in attendance: Karen Haas, Chair (Clerk of the House); Nancy Erickson, Co-Chair (Secretary of the Senate); David Ferriero (Archivist of the United States); Don Ritchie (Historian, U.S. Senate); Matthew Wasniewski (Historian, U.S. House of Representatives); John Lawrence, (Visiting Faculty, University of California); Sharon Leon (Director of Public Projects, Center for History and New Media, George Mason University); Steven Zink (Vice Chancellor, Information Technology, Nevada System of Higher Education).

Members present by teleconference: Thomas Mackey, (McConnell Center, University of Louisville); Jeff Thomas (Archivist, Ohio Congressional Archives, The Ohio State University); Sheryl Vogt (Director, Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies).

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.

HAAS: Good morning. The Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress will come to order. Let me welcome everyone here this morning. For the first time, we are having a meeting of the Advisory Committee with some of our members participating via teleconference, so as we go through the proceedings today, we are going to make a special effort to make sure that they can hear what we are doing, and that we get input from them during our meeting.

Let me start by taking the opportunity to welcome our returning members, Sheryl Vogt and Jeff Thomas, who are participating via telephone, and Steven Zink and Sharon Leon who are here in person today. Thank you for your continued service with the committee. We also are pleased to welcome our two new members, Thomas Mackey, who is joining us via telephone, and John Lawrence, who is here in person.

Tom Mackey was appointed to the Advisory Committee by Senate Minority Leader Mitch McConnell. Dr. Mackey comes to us from the University of Louisville, where he has served as a professor of history since 1991. Dr. Mackey's specialty is in U.S. legal and constitutional history, and he has recently served as the editor of a three volume set entitled, *A Documentary History of the American Civil War Era*. Welcome, Dr. Mackey.

MACKEY: Thank you very much. I am happy to be here, and I am looking forward to helping.

HAAS: Thank you. Our next new addition to the Advisory Committee is John Lawrence. As many of you know, John Lawrence recently retired from the Congress after 38 years of service. His last 8 years of service were with Leader Pelosi. Not only has John been such an important player here in the House of Representatives, but he also comes to us with a degree in history. He has a doctorate in American history from the University of California at Berkeley, and we look forward to John's expertise and service with the committee.

Let me also thank the Secretary of the Senate, Nancy Erickson. I have enjoyed collaborating with her on many issues, and I look forward to continuing the work she has done as the past chair of the Advisory Committee.

And last, but not least, let me welcome the Archivist of the United States, David Ferriero, and thank him for all of his continued work and assistance to all of us.

Let me begin by letting everyone know what we have been up to in the Office of the Clerk since we last met in December. The first 6 months of the Congress has been an extremely busy time. The Office of the House Historian and the Clerk's Office of Art and Archives has continued to work on our web site, which we launched December 28th. We previewed the history web site at our last meeting of the Advisory Committee. The URL for the web site is [history.house.gov](http://history.house.gov). The web site has continued to receive a great deal of positive feedback, and it continues to be a work in progress. There is a flier in your packet that summarizes what you can find on our web site.

At the beginning of the Congress, we sent out letters to all of the House Members offering them archival assistance. This has become one of our routine tasks, and Robin Reeder is going to speak to this issue later in the meeting, not only about our outreach to committees, but also to Members on committees.

We are currently working on a publication with the House Historian's Office documenting the history of the House Page Program. In 2011, when the House Page Program ended, both Speaker Boehner and Leader Pelosi directed the House Historian to prepare an official history of that program.

We have also been working with our committees and the House Recording Studio on a project to transfer historical footage of committee hearings to the National Archives. The Recording Studio has video dating back to the mid-2000s and has begun transferring this material in what is the first comprehensive transfer of hearing videos to the Archives. The goal of this project is to

capture and retain the highest quality version of the footage for permanent preservation.

In January, we launched the Official Committee Repository Project. This project is a one-stop shop for all committee documents. The repository allows committee staff to post their hearing notices, witness biographies and testimony, and text of pertinent legislation among other items. Members of the Hill community have access to this information, as well as the general public, and that information can be accessed in a PDF form and downloaded.

The repository was created in response to the desire of House leadership to continue the efforts to foster transparency in the House. To access that information, you can go through the [clerk.house.gov](http://clerk.house.gov) site for additional information.

Now let me turn it over to the Secretary of the Senate for any remarks she would like to make.

ERICKSON: Welcome, everyone. I particularly want to welcome back Sheryl Vogt, my appointee to this committee. Sheryl is the Director of the Richard Russell Center for Political Research and Studies in Athens, Georgia. I would like to welcome back as well Steven Zink, Senator Reid's appointee to this committee. Steven is the Vice Chancellor for Information Technology of the Nevada System of Higher Education in Las Vegas, Nevada. And I also want to pay special welcome to Thomas Mackey, Senator McConnell's appointee to this Advisory Committee. As Karen noted, he is an author, and he also serves as the Fellow of the McConnell-Chao Center at the University of Louisville. The Center hosts a scholars program, a public lecture series, a civic education program and the McConnell and Secretary Elaine L. Chao Archives.

I have to say that we are fortunate in the Senate to have two leaders, Senator Reid and Senator McConnell, who lead by example on the archiving front.

In my testimony this last month before the Appropriations Committee, I mentioned that since 2006, there have been 63 Senators that have departed the Senate. This has tremendous ramifications for the rate of turnover among our Senate staff, as well as for the work of this committee.

In April, our office hosted a brown bag lunch for archivists and system administrators, aptly entitled, "Preserving the Senate's History in Time of Change." Although the turnover of Senate staff is daunting, I have to say that I was inspired by the turnout that we had in the LBJ room. It was packed. And it is a reminder to me of the tremendous progress that we have made in the Senate bringing attention to the importance of archiving congressional records, and it also gives me confidence that we can continue to make inroads on the preservation front.

At the last meeting, we reviewed the published *Fifth Report*, and I hope our new members have had a chance to read it. We distributed copies of the *Fifth Report* to Senate leadership as well as committee chairmen and ranking members as an opportunity not only to bring their attention to the report, but also to thank them for their role in helping us with the tremendous progress that we have made in archiving. It was also an opportunity for us to acknowledge the important work of the committee archivists, who are important partners with us.

I am looking forward to the update on the Archival Description Project, as we have been working with the Center for the past year and a half on this project. And I understand that just a few weeks ago, we rolled out the new description forms to our committee archivists, and we appreciate their feedback on this form.

And, finally, I would like to thank the Archivist and Richard Hunt for hosting the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress at its annual meeting in May. I appreciated the opportunity to attend the luncheon and hear the opening speaker.

And, finally, I failed to mention to John Lawrence, Leader Pelosi's new appointee on the committee, that I recalled that when you did an interview with one of the Hill newspapers, you mentioned that on your last day of service, you wanted to have a good Capitol tour, and I hope you were able to do that. And in the event that you didn't, I want to make a standing offer to you to have a Senate wing tour of the Capitol any time that that works for you.

That completes my report Karen.

HAAS: Thank you. Let us now hear from David Ferriero.

FERRIERO: Thank you, and good morning.

A special welcome to those of you who are joining us virtually. Let me start by explaining, the reason we are meeting virtually is because of the impact of the sequestration on the National Archives. We have eliminated \$20 million from our budget in the past year. We have done that through a series of maneuvers, starting almost 2 years ago with a hiring freeze, where we are reviewing every opening that comes up to see whether there is a smarter way of doing business; reviewing every one of our contracts; reduced hours of operation in Washington and in College Park on both the research and the public side; and scrutinizing conference travel.

We have tried new ways of conducting our FACA meetings. So this is actually the third of those experiments. We have already done our Advisory Committee on the Electronic Records Archive and our National Historical Publications and Records Commission meetings in this manner, so this is very much a work in progress.

We were given an opportunity to present to our oversight committee our decision-making process on sequestration's mandatory budget cuts, and I must say that we got points, I think, from Chairman Issa and the committee for the seriousness and methodology that we used to determine our budget without furloughs or RIFs, so I am pleased with the outcome of that process. Not crazy about losing \$20 million, but in terms of the process we used to get there.

I wish I could say the same about the future. We are looking at guidance for fiscal year 2015, which requires us to propose 5 and 10 percent reductions to the budget. So this is a long lasting impact.

We have recently released to OMB and to the public a draft of our new strategic plan, which I urge you to take a look at. We will send you the URL. You can go to [archives.gov](http://archives.gov) and find it there, but we will also send you the link to it. It is the first strategic plan since the work that we have done in terms of transformation of the Archives, and I am pretty proud of it, because it is succinct and uses plain language. We have gone from a 42-page strategic plan to an 8-page strategic plan. Four goals, easy to remember. When I ask staff about the goals from the old plan, it is hard to remember them. Make access happen; connect with users; maximize NARA's value to the Nation; and build our future through our people. Four easy-to-remember goals. So I would ask you to take a look at it. There is a feedback loop on the site, so please, please, take a look at it.

Of great importance to this group and to my colleagues are our space problems. We are currently storing 162,000 cubic feet of House and Senate records. That translates into 486 million pages, or almost 5 tons, of the records of Congress. We are transferring in to the Archives 3,000 to 4,000 cubic feet of House and Senate records every year, and we will be out of space by the end of 2014. That, combined with the New Records Management Directive, which was issued by the Archives and OMB, which requires agencies to expedite the transfer of their records, creates a real space crisis for the National Archives. So we will be reviewing proposals for solutions to this problem to bring to you to sometime over the summer so that we can have a conversation about how we are going to solve this problem.

On a happier front, on the 13th of June, we launched "Founders Online." The National Historical Publications Records Commission has for more than 50 years been funding the paper projects of the Founding Fathers, and for the first time we have released a site called "Founders Online" where you can actually search the papers of these six Founding Fathers, including 175,000 documents, letters, diaries and entries from the papers of Washington, Franklin, Jefferson, Madison, Hamilton and Adams. It is absolutely fantastic. And the best part about it is that it contains early documents, things that have not yet been published. We have convinced the Papers Projects to release the documents and the transcriptions even before the publications

come out, so this is really very exciting news.

Since we last met, we have celebrated the centennials of Pat Nixon, Lady Bird Johnson, Richard Nixon, and Gerald Ford. We have dedicated the Bush 43 Presidential Library and Museum, and on Sunday, we will rededicate the FDR Library in Hyde Park. In early November, we will be opening the David M. Rubenstein Gallery down on Pennsylvania Avenue, which is an expansion of our galleries and will incorporate the Magna Carta and new permanent exhibits focusing on rights, women's rights, immigration, and civil rights, supported by a gift from David Rubenstein.

And, finally, join us on the steps of Constitution Avenue on the Fourth of July to celebrate a dramatic reading of the Declaration of Independence, entertainment, and view the parade that passes by the National Archives.

HAAS: David, thank you. And thanks, again, for all the work that you and your staff do to support the work that we all do. It is very much appreciated.

Our next order of business is approval of the minutes. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the minutes?

If not, are there any corrections from the minutes?

Hearing none, I will entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

RITCHIE: So moved.

FERRIERO: Second.

HAAS: All those in favor? Opposed? Ayes have it. It goes forward.

Next, I would like to move on and recognize Karen Paul, the Senate Archivist.

PAUL: Thank you.

At our December meeting, I reported on our targeted outreach to committee systems administrators. This project initially was undertaken to help the systems administrators avoid problems resulting from major system changes. As it so happened, the timing of this effort proved fortuitous because by January we had five committee chairs retire. In December, Senator Inouye, Appropriations chair, passed away. In February, Senator Kerry, Foreign Relations Committee chair, became Secretary of State. There was a total of seven new committee chairs this year. That is 40 percent. Additionally, three ranking members retired.

The resulting fallout for committees was a whopping 57 percent change in staff directors and an

unprecedented 35 percent change in committee chief clerks. Never in my 30 years have I seen that many chief clerks turn over.

Considering this, along with the 2012 Congressional Management Foundation survey showing that 36 percent of staff has fewer than 2 years experience and 57 percent fewer than 5, I think you can appreciate that despite the incremental successes with electronic records acquisition, we suddenly found ourselves running very hard just to stay in place. There were anxious moments when we really did not know which way electronics records preservation was going to go, and we are still evaluating how well we did.

We lost two committee archivists; one as a result of budget downsizing, the other because of committee membership change. If we learned anything, it was this: it is impossible to be too prepared in the face of this magnitude of change. Of course, those committees continuing with their archivists fared much better than those without archivists.

Despite the magnitude of changes in committees, we actually were able to increase the overall number of committees engaged in electronic records archiving to 16, and that is an increase of four committees. The Intelligence Committee is ready to go and we are waiting for the National Archives to become certified so that we can begin to accession those classified electronic records. One other committee is readying files for archiving. So that leaves us with only one legislating committee out of 18 that we are still working with to try to move forward.

What we learned is that sometimes change presents opportunities. In two of the instances of the four I mentioned, it was the committee chair and Ranking Member retirements that enabled us to move the process along, or in other words to initiate it. In two others, it was the retirement of long-serving chief clerks and the archivist, who because of their personal dedication to preservation and archiving, helped us in a very substantial way before their last day of service. And, of course, my hat goes out to those two individuals.

In a couple of instances, we went to the extreme of creating entire committee staff genealogies going back to the mid 1990s, presented these lists, and directly asked for those files. This was unusual for us to go to this extent, but it worked in two of our more difficult instances.

And what I would really love at this point would be to find a more efficient way to keep track of committee staff coming and going because what we have learned is accessioning electronic records requires that degree of specificity.

Another way we encouraged the committees was the use of our committee archives accession reports, which are submitted to the Committee on Rules as the committee's biannual budget request, and these were compiled by Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler. This time we created a

supplemental report just on the electronic records archiving activity. Also, when a couple of the committees found "zero" and "no" under the categories, they were moved to begin the process.

And finally, for committee archiving, I wanted to mention an important new accession -- that is original committee hearing broadcasts from the 109th Congress, which are being processed by the Center. These are open records and join the 108th Congress recordings already at the Archives.

For Members' archiving, of the 15 Members who departed the Senate, three are keeping their records in personal custody for the time being, but of the six committee chairs and three ranking Members who retired, all donated their collections to research repositories. We made it a point in the process to stress the importance of preserving the Senators' and senior staff emails, and are hopeful that at least some were preserved.

Senator Lieberman was outstanding in this regard to the extent that he published a press release announcing that he was donating his records. Obviously, that press release got circulated to the other Members. And I have to thank Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler, who used to work on his committee, for help arranging for that press release.

We are working now with Senate offices that will be closing at the end of this Congress and with two offices in particular that are in the process of closing their office. That would be Senator Cowan and Senator Lautenberg.

An issue that has come to our attention and is of great concern is what will happen to the electronic records of the Members who are not donating them right to a repository. We have addressed this issue by suggesting cloud storage and by providing the departing Members with information on personal archiving best practices.

Because we have a lot of new people coming and seasoned people leaving, we focused heavily on outreach efforts during the past 6 months. We did a records management seminar in March for new offices. We conducted committee briefings and new office briefings one-on-one. Secretary Erickson previously mentioned the Archivist's brown bag on the topic, "Preserving Senate History During Times of Change," where we highlighted various types of change and how they can pose a threat to records preservation. We used a panel of seasoned staff who shared some of their techniques. We specifically wanted to have systems administrators attend this meeting, so we offered a prize. And I have to thank our chef and Deputy Archivist Alison White, who provided cupcakes for that and also helped us design wonderful bookmarks which were the prize, that advertised where people can get help during times of change.

We continue to encourage archival training for staff at the Modern Archives Institute, and I am

pleased to say that two Members sent their key staff in June. And I think one of them is here today. Is Marie Carr here? Marie -- raise your hand.

CARR: I am here.

PAUL: Did you enjoy the institute?

CARR: I loved it. It was very good.

PAUL: Marie is working for Senator Baucus and is doing a wonderful job there.

And finally, an outreach we did that is new to our office is enlist the help of the customer support analysts, the CSAs. There are a legion of these people who work for the Sergeant-at-Arms, and they are the ombudsman for each Senate office. We have enlisted their help to spread our preservation message especially among the systems administrators and administrative directors by submitting talking points to that group of people. They can use these when they work for the offices.

All of this outreach required quite an array of new and revised educational products. I will just hold up a couple. The newest for Senators was "A Note about Your Historical Records"; and we revised the "Guidelines for Preservation" pamphlet. The Archivists' Toolkit went into the second edition with the addition of four or five more tools.

We created papers on best practices for preserving the Senators' electronic records. Although we have done something similar, this was really different because it went into more of the technical aspects of preserving a Member's papers over time, on social media archiving guidance, committee records management, and best practices for the new Congress and beyond. This was very different from anything we have released before. We aimed for the new chief clerks. And it was really interesting because a lot of these new clerks were calling to ask how to do their job, so we created these as a response to their question. It was a good opportunity to establish some standards.

We revised and substantially upgraded the "Committee Systems Administrator Guidance" pamphlet to emphasize their key role in ensuring that the digital records survive during times of change.

And to follow up on what Secretary Erickson said about the use of the *Fifth Report* and our distribution, we put a cover letter that boiled the executive summary down into five points so that if they didn't read the executive summary in the report, hopefully they might have skimmed the cover letter. And I can report that I know of at least two people who read the report, quite

unexpectedly. The Senate Rules Committee out of the blue invited me to a meeting where the staff director and her deputy said that the report had -- I hate to do this -- but "inspired" them to review their own records management. So for a full hour and a half, I listened to narratives from each staffer and was able, hopefully, to offer some helpful comments. But to top it off, they even asked for a second copy of the report, because they wanted to have it to refer to over time. Needless to say, that afterwards, I thought I had dreamt all of this!

As an update on the legislative commissions issue, the Office of the Secretary has been working with the Legislative Counsel on a draft of a template that includes archiving, in addition to other administrative issues. In the interim, the Office of the Legislative Counsel is asking their clients if they would like to include provisions for the archiving of the commission's records, and for funding provisions for archiving.

We are pleased that we have the attention of that office, and that they are making this need known to the people who ask them to draft legislation. But, I still think we need to think of ways to reach out through the committees on this issue, as well as to try to come at it during the drafting stage, and perhaps through the committee archivists to publicize the need for archiving language when a commission is actually created.

And finally, to wrap up, I wanted to give you an update on our social media guidance. At the December meeting, we reviewed our attempts to persuade offices to preserve their social media records. Most of the Members' offices that closed had not thought about it prior to our raising the issue with them. We produced guidance for the offices that wanted to do this. We suggested to offices to consider that the public responses, comments, tweets and general reactions to posted materials are as important as tracking what the office is publicly posting.

Some of the committee archivists are experimenting with this. Deputy Archivist Alison White used the free trial period with Cloud Preservation to download a series of sites of several committees where a chair or ranking member was changing, and the committee lacked a professional archivist. Our HELP Committee archivist, Will Arthur, used Cloud Preservation to download Facebook, YouTube and Twitter postings for his committee at the close of the 112th Congress. We are currently appraising these materials and have certainly noted that a change in committee leadership directly impacts the committee's social media content. Obviously, it would. And this supports our advice that the policy of capturing this material annually or by the Congress is highly recommended.

Two of our committee archivists, Katie Delacenserie, of Homeland Security, and Anu Kasarabada, of Judiciary, Democratic, did a lively presentation about their social media archiving at a recent ACSC meeting. This was done to encourage congressional Centers' staff who are collecting and specializing in congressional collections, to think about collecting this

material on their own. Thank you.

HASS: Thanks, Karen.

RITCHIE: Madam Chair?

HAAS: Yes.

RITCHIE: I would just like to add that Karen has indicated how busy her operation has been with those 63 Senators who have left in the last half dozen years, and that she and her staff have visited each one. It is always difficult, especially if someone has died or been defeated in the election, when there is a deadline to get records achieving finished. Karen has not mentioned in her report that she has also put a little muscle into this with some staff who don't realize that electronic records do need to be preserved. So we are aware that a very large percentage of that material has been saved because of her efforts.

And one other person to mention is Hope Grebner. Karen mentioned previously that we have staff consisting of Alison and Elisabeth. However this summer, we also have an intern, Hope, who is from Indiana University, and is getting her master's degree. She previously worked on Birch Bayh's papers and will be leaving us to go back to work on Richard Lugar's papers at the university. We were very happy to have that additional assistance through the summer months. And we are looking forward to training a new generation of archivists to work with these records.

HAAS: Thank you very much.

Let me now turn to Robin Reeder, the House Archivist, for her comments.

REEDER: Thank you, Karen.

In the last 6 months, we have received many requests from House Members, both new Members and Members that have been here for a while for records management consultations. Thus far, we have had 27 consultations. Twelve of these have been with new Members, while 15 were with Members who have been in office for a period of time.

It is important to mention that our meetings with departing Member offices also included meetings with staff of vacant offices who are manning the offices until the special elections of the new Members occurred. Another thing to note is that we haven't had as many committee consultations as we did in the previous 6 months, but we think this is because in the last Congress there was the leadership change so we had a lot of new personal staff that we were meeting with.

One of the big projects that my office has been working on has been a transfer of the 111th Congress records to the Center for Legislative Archives. Alison Trulock has been heading up

the effort for that as well as Heather Bourk. They are just about done with the transfer. There is just a small amount left along with some electronic records. I want to send a big thank you out to Tom Eisinger, who has been very helpful with that effort, and Donald Collier, both from the Center for Legislative Archives. Tom also had rotating staff helping from the Archives. They came to help prepare the records, so a special thanks to Kris Wilhelm and Kate Mollan for their help with that as well.

Alison Trulock continues as our project manager leading the House efforts on the Next-Generation Finding Aid, and she will be talking to you later in the meeting about her work on this front.

Heather Bourk, on our staff, continues to deal with the vast amounts of photographs within the Office of Art and Archives, the House collection and the Historian's Office. She also has been quite busy scanning and putting many of these photos on our Web site, as well as coordinating with committees on archiving their electronic records.

And here are some statistics since our last Advisory Committee meeting. As I mentioned, we have had 27 Member consultations, and two consultations with committees. We have had 583 cubic feet of records transferred to us. We have loaned 48 cubic feet of records back to the committees. And we have sent out a total of 1,260 empty boxes to the committees for archiving as well.

And that is my report. Thank you.

HAAS: Thanks, Robin.

Robin and her staff have been extremely busy. With the last couple of elections and the turnover in the House, it has made it important for them to continue their efforts. They have had a lot of meetings with Members. We have also had a lot of departing Members, not during an election time creating many vacant offices to service. Whatever the reason, death in office or a decision to resign, those are difficult situations to deal with, so Robin and her staff deserve a lot of credit for all of their efforts.

HUNT: Just to add, if you don't mind --

HAAS: Sure.

HUNT: I would like to add to what Robin said. Tom Eisinger crunched the numbers, and the 111th Congress is the second largest transfer of House records in the last 20 years.

HAAS: Wow.

HUNT: So clearly the message has gotten out about the importance of archiving committee records..

HAAS: Thank you.

HUNT: And I would also just like to point out that the Congressional Affairs Office has been very active in bringing Members of Congress, primarily House Members, to visit us, and it is a good opportunity for them to understand that they have this archival assistance from the House Archivist. When either members of the House or the Senate come by, we always put a plug in for the services of your fine archivists.

HAAS: Richard, I am glad you raised that, because the feedback that we have gotten on this has been really positive, so thank you so much for that.

HUNT: Sure.

ERICKSON: And we noted that Senator Flake, in his maiden speech to the Senate, mentioned his visit to the National Archives during orientation and what an impact that had on him.

HAAS: Oh, excellent. As our next order of business, I would like to ask Jacqie Ferry, Alison White, and Alison Trulock to come to the table and speak to us on the Next-Generation Finding Aid.

FERRY: Good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to give a report on the Center's Next-Generation Finding Aid project. For the new members joining us, I am going to give just a very brief history of the project. At the June 2011 meeting, the Advisory Committee endorsed the findings of the Center for History and New Media's Next-Generation Finding Aids Report, which recommended several activities to improve description and online access to House and Senate records.

Our current work falls into three categories, which are represented in the diagram on the second page of the handout. The first circle, legacy description, is an effort to convert the Center's legacy finding aid and description records that are compliant with both National Archives data standards and national description standards. The Center has finished conversion of preliminary inventories for the first 70 Congresses as well as for the 75th Congress, for which we have created approximately 8,100 enhanced description records.

The second circle represents a project to create enhanced description of modern congressional

records, which are comprised primarily of committee records from the 1970's to the present, and for which we typically have minimal descriptive data. While some of these records are closed, many are fully or partially opened for research use. To improve access to these records, the Center has created approximately 4,000 enhanced description records for the 92nd through 96th Congresses.

The third circle represents the collaborative description program. I will talk more about this initiative at the end of my report, and so will Alison White and Alison Trulock.

On the following page is a chart showing the total volume of House and Senate holdings as of March 31st of this year. The blue column shows the total volume of fully described records from our enhanced description project. In less than 2 years, the Center has created enhanced description of 38,503 cubic feet of records, which comprises approximately 24 percent of House and Senate holdings.

The minimally described records are described at the series level, but those records have not yet been fully described as part of our enhanced description project: 33.1 percent of House and Senate records fall into this category. So that is the gray bar.

When the project started, approximately 91,000 cubic feet of records were minimally described. We have reduced that to just over 53,000 cubic feet in the past 2 years, and we will continue to chip away at this category over the next few years.

Finally, 42.8 percent of House and Senate records are currently closed. As segments of these records become open, they will be fully described. In addition, with the transfer of enhanced accessioning metadata from the House and Senate in the future, these closed records will come to the Archives nearly fully described.

The next page has a graphical representation of the data in the previous chart. The blue bars represent the volume of records described during the last 3 fiscal years. In fiscal year 2011, we described approximately 12,000 cubic feet, in fiscal year 2012, we described nearly 20,000 cubic feet, and in the first half of fiscal year 2013, we have described approximately 7,000 cubic feet of records, for a grand total of 24.1 percent of records fully described.

The blue bars will continue to grow as we complete more descriptions, and the gray bar represents minimally described records will continue to shrink. The bar representing closed records will grow as we receive new accessions and shrink as these records become open and fully described.

The fruit of our descriptive labor can be found in the National Archives Online Public Access

system, also known as OPA, a screen shot of which can be found on the next page. OPA is the replacement system for the National Archives Archival Research Catalogue, more commonly known as ARC, which will be retired later this summer. OPA is the new online access system for description records, authority records, digital images and other online content from units across the National Archives.

This is a screen shot of a description record created during our modern records description project. The record describes correspondence from the House Committee on Armed Services during the 92nd Congress. This enhanced description record includes a detailed arrangement statement, a scope and content note specifying the name of the outgoing correspondent and type of correspondence, access and use restrictions specific to the 17 boxes of records, a unique identifier used to locate the records at the Archives, as well as other descriptive elements.

To date, approximately 2,700 description records have been added to ARC and OPA as part of our enhanced description project. If you visit OPA, and I encourage you to do so, you will find records covering the 75th Congress, the 58th Congress and the 92nd through 95th Congresses, and every month, we are adding more.

Now that a few Congresses have been fully described in OPA, we hope to work with the Office of Innovation at the National Archives to develop a customized search portal for congressional records that builds off this rich descriptive data. Over the coming months, we plan to solicit feedback from the Advisory Committee, researchers, and other stakeholders about the search portal.

On the next page is a diagram of our new description environment, which brings together contributors and tools from across the Center, House, and Senate. The Collaborative Description Program is comprised of various contributors, represented by ovals and various interrelated systems or tools that manage descriptive information about the records throughout their lifecycle. These systems or tools are represented by rectangles.

First, the description program begins with the records creators, the committees. And for those committees with archivists, this also includes them. The records' creators are the key to making this entire program work. The records' creators are most familiar with the records and are in the best position to provide accurate, detailed descriptive data about the records at or near the point of record creation.

The records' creators complete a transfer form, which they submit to the House Office of Art and Archives or the Senate Historical Office. The data in these forms is then added to the Archivists' Toolkit by the House and Senate. Alison Trulock and Alison White will go into more detail about this process.

When the records are transferred to the Center, they are now accompanied by rich description information in the form of structured standards-compliant data that can be easily imported into various systems, including the Center's Instance of Archivists' Toolkit and, eventually, Online Public Access, OPA.

This data will be managed and enhanced by Center staff within Archivists' Toolkit until the records are open for research use. Once the records are open, the data in Archivists' Toolkit will be imported into NARA's Description and Authority Services -- we call it DAS -- which will become the back-end system supporting the National Archives Online Public Access, after ARC is retired later this summer.

I would like to highlight several milestones in the past 6 months that have been reached in this project. First, the Center successfully installed the server database and Archivists' Toolkit application in the test lab at Archives II. We thoroughly tested the system, and the Capitol Planning and Investment Control Board approved our move to production environment this spring. The production environment consists of application and installations on 19 staff work stations at the Center and a remote connection to a secure Sequel database on a dedicated server at Archives II.

As part of the move to production, the Center has worked with NARA's IT staff to ensure that the system complies with NARA's rigorous system security and data backup requirements. Final roll-out and staff training will commence in July once we receive official approval to operate from the chief information officer.

Second, we worked with the House to create custom export reports to extract accessioning metadata created by the House in Archivists' Toolkit. In preparation for the transfer of records from the 111th Congress, the House created over 350 accession records in Archivists' Toolkit, which we are now able to import into our instance of Archivists' Toolkit.

Third, the Center helped the Senate create a new XML transfer form. We also wrote a custom style sheet for the Senate that transforms the XML transfer data into XML that is compliant with the Archivists' Toolkit accession schema. With these two new tools, the Senate and the Center are able to import accessioning data created by the committees directly into Archivists' Toolkit.

When this project began, there were three or more separate processes in the House, Senate, and National Archives for managing descriptive information about committee records. These processes did not provide the flexibility needed to exchange, share, and re-purpose this descriptive data, but these processes have now been integrated and normalized, and we are now able to share standardized data across systems and institutional boundaries.

We also faced a huge volume of modern congressional records described only at a high series level, which communicated little useful information to researchers about our records and how they could be used. We have now fully described one quarter of these records, and we have acquired the experience needed to complete the remainder of this work.

In addition, we are now reaching a greater variety of researchers through our enhanced description efforts. I would like to conclude with two examples from the past year. Last year Adam Berenbak helped a researcher from Israel, who contacted the Center after searching NARA's catalogue and finding one of our new description records from the 93rd Congress. The record in particular was from the House Select Committee on Crime. The scope and content note described various topics covered by the committee's public hearings, one of which concerned drugs and, more specifically, treatment of drug addiction. The researcher found the subject term in ARC and contacted us. We screened the boxes, and the researcher spent a few days reviewing the records.

And just last Thursday, as I was writing this, we received reference requests from two different researchers who found the Center through our enhanced description. Rod Ross fielded one of these requests from a researcher who was interested in transnational movie theaters. Through the catalogue, the researcher found relevant records on 20th Century Fox and other companies from the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs from the 95th Congress.

These examples highlight not only the myriad topics covered in congressional records but also the importance of providing detailed descriptive information that can be accessed online by researchers around the world. These examples also serve as a reminder of just how far we have come in 2 short years. Thank you.

TRULOCK: Good morning. I would also like to thank the committee for allowing me the opportunity to address you all this morning.

I think the main goal of all the work that we have done on the Next-Generation Finding Aid Project has really been about access, so I am just going to highlight the ways in which our progress has enhanced access to the records.

Since May 2011, the Office of Art and Archives has been using Archivists' Toolkit to capture accession information and also describe records, older records from open Congresses. Through collaboration with the Center, we have refined and improved our accession process for House records and then mapped this process to the functionality provided by Archivists' Toolkit.

We have also used Archivists' Toolkit to create accession information for both textual and

electronic records, and this information was transferred to the Center along with the actual physical transfer of the 111th Congress records which amounted to about 4,200 boxes of records, so it was quite a bit of information and a lot of work, as you all heard earlier.

Since we have the records on site, we store them for a total of 4 years, we are actually able to work with the records while we have them on site, so we can do enhanced description that is provided to us by the committees and add some additional access points to the record, such as controlled headings, vocabulary, subject and name headings; the information that we get from the committees.

Finally, our other major point of access that we have been able to utilize is the new House Web site. This has offered us an opportunity to make available EAD finding aids of House records for older House records that are opened, and we created those using the resource module of Archivists' Toolkit.

The handout that you all have from me is the finding aid from the Judiciary Committee from the 95th Congress. It shows you an overview of the kind of information that we are getting out to people through the Web site. You can see there are controlled headings and a higher level inventory of the records of the Judiciary Committee from the 95th Congress.

Some of the benefits of working toward enhanced access for our office has been both internal and external. Internally, we have really been able to refine our processes and have better management of the records that we are receiving from the committees, which is great for us because it facilitates our accountability to the committees, which is really important. It has also encouraged us to have more direct interaction with the records while we have them on site. This helps us pinpoint committees who may need a little extra help with their archiving in terms of the description that they are providing to us. We can provide better guidance and feedback to them because we have a better sense of the kinds of records that they are sending to us.

Externally, we are capturing more and better information at the time the records are coming into our possession. This ultimately facilitates better access to the records down the road at the Center for Legislative Archives, because when we are sending the records to the Center, they have a basic level of intellectual control over the records that we weren't providing them with before. Hopefully this will reduce some of the backlog of undescribed records down the road and give researchers a starting point for access to those records in the future.

And finally, while we have made great strides, and it has been really a rewarding experience, there have definitely been some challenges, and I am just going to touch briefly on what some of those have been for us.

First, and foremost for the House, is that we are dealing with record creators who are not always providing the best descriptive information to us at the outset, and for whom sometimes archiving isn't always their first priority -- imagine that -- but since we have the records on site, we are able to alleviate some of those challenges of dealing with hesitant record creators. Also it gives us the opportunity, as I said, to increase our outreach and better target our outreach to committees to address that challenge.

Another major challenge I am sure we all can attest to is that it is just really very time consuming, Not just to do description, which we all know is time consuming, but the work that all of us have done in terms of aligning all of our processes of the stakeholders into one process has been time consuming, but very rewarding.

And finally, looking ahead to what is on the horizon, Archives Space is launching in the fall, so that will be another hurdle for us to tackle as that comes along down the pipeline. I think the Center and the House are going to look to the next steps of collaboration in terms of aligning some of the description that we are doing with some of the description that they are doing and figuring out another good process for sharing that information.

So we have made great strides, it has been a really rewarding process, and thank you for allowing me to tell you about this today.

WHITE: The Senate has some hesitant record describers as well. I would say your list of challenges are our list of challenges as well.

TRULOCK: Right.

WHITE: My handout is an example of our newest accession form. This is really a combination of two accession forms we have been using, but it is what we are doing with it that is, I think, very exciting for us and hopefully for the Center, too. We used a hobbit example in the sample descriptions. I have to thank Brandon Hirsch for the inspiration for that. It was really fun to make. We thought an example of a filled-out form would be useful to the people using the form, and because of the sensitivity of records and closure issues, we wanted to share something that no one could dispute and was okay to share. So that is how we came up with this as an example and a guide for people using our new form.

At the recent ACSC meeting, the Center, the Senate, and the House presented on this topic. I went into some detail about the Senate's efforts over the years and the increase in the amounts and types of metadata we have been trying to capture. It has only been in the last 4 years that we have been capturing that data electronically. And with this new form, we are capturing thorough description in such a way that once it is entered into the form, it is automatically encoded in

XML. With Jacqie's help with creating a style sheet, we are transforming that data through doing an XSLT (style sheet for XML) transformation, and we are putting it into Archivists' Toolkit.

And so what is great about this? I think a lot of things are great about this. The fact that we are using AT, or this toolkit, to hold this data; that the Center is using AT to receive and hold this data, as well as their HMS system; that they are set up to match one another; that the House is using Archivists' Toolkit, as well; that while the House and the Senate may not both be using the same fields, neither of us are using a field in a way that is different from one another, so that when the Center receives our materials and the House's materials, there is a compatibility that will be, I think, hugely helpful to researchers down the road when this material becomes available.

Now, the other thing to consider is the difference between House and Senate records and how they are archived. For the Senate, we may not be sending materials every Congress. We may be sending the materials of a staffer who has been at the Senate for a long time working on a particular committee, working on different materials over time. Having the ability of describing that material at the point of transfer and being able to put that in a place where, if the committee wants to call that information back, and it is well described, they know what piece of it they want, and having all of that reside in Archivists' Toolkit is pretty phenomenal, in my mind.

It is going to be very useful because the Center sends a lot of loans back to us as Senate material can be reused by the committees. So while we are thinking down the road of the researcher, we are also thinking about our immediate constituency, and that is our committees. We have our committee archivists to thank for doing a really good job of describing material along the way so that those functions can happen.

The other thing that I think is kind of neat about the way we are doing it is this XML encoding because it is working with Archivists' Toolkit. We are using the accessions module of Archivists' Toolkit to hold an awful lot of information. But because we are capturing it in XML, with the next move toward Archives Space or something else down the road, I think we have put this information into a place where it has possible uses that we haven't even thought of at this time. And the way we are encoding it is going to really help us with that in the future. So, understandably, we are very excited about the actual current use of this metadata and about the world of possibilities down the road.

If you look at the handout, you can see the kinds of data that we are capturing -- data about the physical form of transfer. In the scope and content record, we are asking for some excellent descriptive data; we are going to be able to create name and subject records from that information. And we are able to hold it in a place that even though some of this material isn't going to be rolled out to the public for a long time, when it is, it is going to be largely ready to go.

And that is the other thing I think that is really great about this.

So when open records came along -- and Karen referenced the 109th committee video recordings that we recently transferred -- we used our new form. I was able to input these using Archivists' Toolkit. And when those are completely processed and available and ready to go into OPA, or ARC, that description is going to be ready to go. And that is really great because it serves, again, that dual purpose of our immediate constituency and the researchers that we are hoping to help down the road.

So I want to emphasize that getting all of the information in one place and all three of us working together, that because of all of this we are able to meet the needs of our current users and future researchers as well.

HAAS: Thank you all. As everyone has heard, there is a great deal of effort that has gone into this project. So thank you all for your continued work in this area.

FERRIERO: Can I just suggest, Richard, this common language you have created is a major breakthrough and it is the kind of staff work that the Archivist recognizes in the annual awards. So this is worthy of a nomination for an Archivist achievement award.

HUNT: Thank you.

ERICKSON: Sharon, I would be interested in hearing from you since you have spent a great deal of time on the Next-Generation Finding Aid.

LEON: I could not be more pleased with the way things are going. I think that what we are starting to see is exactly what the committee that worked on the report was hoping for, and that was we were going to see increased efficiency across all the offices and diminished redundancy. I think the thing that I am most interested in, and most concerned about, is watching what happens in the next 6 months as ARC goes away for good and OPA makes its place in the world. I am curious to see the increased ability of researchers to find records; whether we are going to see that actually come to fruition. I am wondering -- maybe, David, you can speak to this -- if there is going to be additional fine tuning and functionality coming from OPA.

FERRIERO: There is, but we have moved beyond expecting people to come to us. We need to be pushing this information out.

LEON: That was my next question. When can I get my feeds?

FERRIERO: That's what we need to be working on. We need to plan that. Because we have

learned, you know, as wonderful as it is to have all this available, unless we don't plant it out there where the people are instead of expecting people to come to us, it doesn't work.

LEON: Good.

FERRIERO: Learned that from a person at George Mason, as a matter of fact.

LEON: Ah, yeah. He was not there at George Mason when you learned it from him. He worked for you at that point. So the question about the feeds is, I think, a question that I am certain that the folks at the House are interested in and I assume the folks at the Senate are interested in. As you work on your own Web sites, what we would really like to see is pulling all of this data back into in a dynamic way through your Web sites, as well, so that we have as many access points as possible. I am hoping that that is the next possibility as we move forward with putting that data online.

HAAS: Excellent point. Before we move on, Sheryl or Jeff, do you have anything to add to this?

VOGT: Nancy, this is Sheryl. I just wanted to say I was very happy after all this time to hear this report. It is what we have been waiting for. And, of course, we have been aware of what has been going on in the last 2 years, but to see this all come together is very rewarding, I think, to all of us.

I do want to say that the transfer form that the Senate is using, offers some aspects that would be applicable for those of us working with Members' papers, that we could adapt some of this for our use, as well. So it is always good when we can multi-purpose something like that. So thank you for all the good work.

HAAS: Thanks, Sheryl. The next order of business is actually to hear from Sheryl, who, as you all know, is joining us via telephone. She is going to report on the ACSC's most recent meeting. Sheryl?

VOGT: Thank you. I would like to also start out by saying a big thank you to Richard Hunt and David Ferriero for hosting again the annual meeting of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress in early May of this year. Nancy Erickson was able to join us, as mentioned earlier, and I think many of you were on hand for much of the meeting. I thought I would go through a few of the sessions just to give you a flavor and also to give you an idea of how people are working with congressional records.

After a welcome from the Archivist, Julian Zelizer, who is a professor of history and public

affairs at Princeton, gave the keynote. His topic was the revitalization of political history and what that trend means for the study of Congress and research in Members' papers. He noted that, since 1995, there has been a return to writing political history, especially the history of Congress, its impact on American life, and the shape of political debate. His paper is now published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*.

The always popular session of former Members discussing the donation of their papers was a panel of Representatives Chet Edwards of Texas, Jim Kolbe of Arizona, and Vic Snyder of Arkansas. I think this was really one of our more thoughtful panels. They offered a couple of suggestions for working with Congress to preserve Members' papers, and when I finish, I am going to ask Karen to tell you a little bit more about how we are going to follow up on that.

Another favorite session is "Research in Congressional Holdings," and here we had a panel of three researchers. One was Peter Shulman of Case Western Reserve. He is mainly using executive records and congressional committee records to research America, energy, and the world from 1840 to 1940. Pascal Massinon is a Ph.D. candidate at University of Michigan. He is using Senate Judiciary files to study home taping, copyrights, and regulations in the U.S. from 1981 to 1992. And, finally, we had Todd Purdum, who is the national editor for *Vanity Fair*. And he enjoyed using the papers of Presidents Johnson and Kennedy and Senators Humphrey and Dirksen in writing his book, "The Civil Rights Act of 1964." So I think you can see the varied interests that we have in congressional papers right now.

Of course, Alison mentioned earlier that they gave a presentation for the meeting on the collaboration project for the new finding aid, and that was well received by everyone. And then we also had a session featuring social media.

Just to tell you quickly, you know, we give away three awards each year. The Raymond Smock Fellowship was awarded to James Williams, who was the director of the Al Gore Research Center at Middle Tennessee State University. This award is for a person to attend the ACSC meeting for the first time. It is a staff member of one of our institutional members.

The Richard Baker Graduate Student Research Travel Grant was awarded to David Ballentyne. He is a Ph.D. candidate at Cambridge University, and his project is "Ernest Hollings and the Transformation of South Carolina Politics From 1948 to 1975." And, of course, that will take him to South Carolina Political Collections this fall.

The recipient of the Congressional Papers Roundtable Award, which allows for a new archivist to attend that roundtable forum at the Society of American Archivists meeting, was Danielle Emerling. She is one of two processing archivists that were recently hired by the University of Delaware to process the Biden papers. She is also a colleague of Hope Grebner, whom I believe

Don Ritchie mentioned earlier. They came out of the same Center in Indiana.

This month, we awarded our third prize for National History Day, and this prize is awarded to an outstanding entry in any category, from either the junior or senior division, which has its primary focus as the history of Congress. This year's winner was a senior group of four students from Texas. They created a Web site called "The Voting Rights Act of 1965: One Vote, One Voice," and their bibliography cites use of the National Archives, the House of Representatives, and the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation. I looked at that Web site and have to say it is outstanding. So you could probably get that information for looking at the Web site from Richard Hunt. And I would like to thank Christine Blackerby. I don't know if she is there or not, but she has made this award each year on behalf of ACSC.

Beginning in 2014, Congress Week will move from September to the first week in April. This is to commemorate the dates in 1789 when the House and Senate achieved their first quorum. And so our fourth annual Congress Week will be the week of April the 7th in 2014, and its theme will mark the 225th anniversary of Congress. We will have more to come on that later.

I do want to note that, in looking back at 1789 and the first Congress, which is really not my field -- I am more modern than that -- I did note that first Congress made arrangements to preserve their records, which I thought was something that in the very beginning that preserving the record of Congress was important.

This was our 10th meeting, and this will usher in our fourth ACSC president. The incoming president is Frank Mackaman, who is the director of the Dirksen Congressional Center. I am glad to have him as the new president.

Our next meeting will be in May of 2014 at the South Carolina Political Collections at the University of South Carolina. Now I would like to turn it over to Karen Paul to tell you about an exciting project.

PAUL: Thank you, Sheryl. As Sheryl mentioned, Congressman Chet Edwards made an offer during his presentation at ACSC to help coordinate a collaborative records management advocacy effort between ACSC and the United States Association of Former Members of Congress. This offer struck a responsive note with the executive committee, who have been discussing an expanded outreach role for ACSC. Robin Reeder and I were asked to chair a task force on how to best work with the USAFMC. To date, we have drafted an initiating memo and talking points that are under executive board review.

A joint letter from the two groups is imagined as a first step, and we also wish to explore any other potential avenues of outreach. For example, we might assemble testimonials or statements

from former Members and donors about addressing records management at the beginning of service that could become a kind of preservation endorsement resource bank. Another idea is to produce an outreach product, it might be a letter or an information packet, for the planned 2014 Congress Week to kind of wrap these efforts together.

But the task force hopes to develop a plan that will establish an ongoing relationship between ACSC and the Association of Former Members that will allow us to tap into their ability to communicate with current Members and would help reinforce a solid preservation message.

And I would say I am personally very excited about this because in the *Fifth Report*, we pointed out that we still feel that there is more that could be done in outreach to the new Members and to get that message across much sooner, which is a difficult goal to achieve. We have been looking for ways to try to expand outreach, so we have latched on to this with the hopes that the former Members may have venues of entree to the new Members that we wouldn't necessarily have.

HAAS: Thank you. Any comments?

Okay. Now I would like to turn to Richard Hunt for an update from the Center.

HUNT: And I want to keep my remarks brief. You have the benefit of our midyear report. At the midyear, we give you a statistical snapshot, but you get an idea of all of the activities that we are involved in and how much ground we cover with a relatively small staff. And it is, you know, entirely due to the great talent and level of expertise we have at the Center.

I would make one addition about the ACSC meeting. I was particularly impressed with the social media session that we did, which we combined Natalie Rocchio, our social media person, with our partners at presidential libraries, who have been very active on the social media front, and then with representatives from the congressional centers. There was an audible buzz in the crowd, where those people from various centers around the country very simply understood what kind of impact they could have with a minimal amount of effort to reach new audiences. I was very pleased, and there has been some activity on that front within ACSC.

I will also report that the National Archives Tumblr site with today's document just passed 100,000 followers. The presidential libraries blog has 100,000 followers, and Natalie reports today *Congress and the Archives* blog is at 90,000. So we are closing in.

ERICKSON: Okay, Don, now you have to talk about our new venture into social media.

RITCHIE: I think we have 400 followers.

ERICKSON: And growing. And growing.

HUNT: I would also like to point out that the Center benefits from our flexibility and our bench strength. A few months ago, Jessie Kratz, who was a longtime staff member at the Center and multi-talented -- David and the leadership were smart enough to select her as the agency historian for the National Archives. We gave her our well wishes, but we had a problem in that she did so many things in so many areas, who was going to inherit the burden? And I am happy to report that most of that extra work fell on our present staff member Martha Grove, who has a background and experience in museum studies. She has taken over the responsibility for the Capitol Visitor's Center exhibit content. So we had a pretty seamless transition there.

You will notice that some of our outreach staff members had to miss today's meeting. They are doing an instructional session with the Senate Page School today on the legislative process. We are happy to do that.

I would note, our level of collaboration was visible in the last presentation, but, between the House and the Senate Archivists and committee staff, we had over 40 meetings and consultations in the first 6 months of this year. We have never had that close of an exchange and, collaboration and cooperation with House and Senate stakeholders. I think it is to the benefit of us all.

If you go past the midyear and up to today's date, we have ingested over 25 terabytes of electronic data from the House and the Senate this year. The Senate has just sent us an additional multiple amount of terabytes of digital committee hearings. I can assure you that Brandon and Shannon have their hands full managing this data and getting it into safe storage, but they are doing a great job.

And then you had mentioned legislative branch commissions, so I will announce that another legislative branch commission's records are coming to us in September: the National Commission for the Review of the Research and Development Programs of the United States Intelligence Community. And like all other recent commissions, most of these records will be in electronic form, so there will be some resources devoted to that processing as well.

And, finally -- this was alluded to earlier -- after Karen had arranged a meeting with the Senate Intelligence Committee staff and we had an understanding of where they were on their electronic records front, we had a follow-up meeting with CIA folks, and then we had a meeting that included the CIA and the IT security administrators at the National Archives. And our IT security administrators report they are midstream in the process of getting the classified version of the congressional records instance approved. So there is an unclassified version where your normal records go, and then a classified version that has to be certified by the CIA before we can put a classified records in there. So it is ongoing. I can't give you a timeline or an exact date

when the classified version will be ready.

FERRIERO: We have a similar arrangement with Presidential records. We have a classified and an unclassified instance within areas. So this isn't anything new in terms of technology, but certification is separate.

HUNT: Any questions?

PAUL: Do you have any sense of where in the process the project is?

HUNT: The requirements were transferred to the National Archives. The IT staff and security staff were going back to CIA to get clarification on exactly what they wanted. I can't tell you what CIA does on their end. We can push the National Archives in completing the requirements.

PAUL: So where is the ball? Which court is it in?

HUNT: At the moment, it is with the National Archives to provide the information on the system and the network and the facility and meeting all of the security requirements.

PAUL: Is there anything you can do to express your interest and move it along?

HUNT: I can have the Archivist of the United States --

FERRIERO: Well, I have to find out where the ball is, actually.

HAAS: Thank you, Richard. Now it is time to turn to any new business that we might have. Does anybody have anything for us? Matt?

WASNIEWSKI: Yes, I almost hesitate to ask. I mean, we just finished the Fifth Report, and in reviewing that and reviewing all these materials, you know, it seems to me there is going to be a lot of continuity in terms of projects on the horizon. I have listened to Karen's report and Richard's and Robin's, and legislative commissions obviously are going to be on the radar, digital records preservation generally, finding aides, outreach to Members.

But is there -- and I throw this to the whole committee -- are there any other items out there, looking forward the next 5 years, that we may be out there on the horizon that we should take into consideration? Because now would be a good time to do that as we start fresh. And I don't have a ready answer to that. We have so many items on the agenda already.

VOGT: Matt? This is Sheryl.

WASNIEWSKI: Hi, Sheryl.

VOGT: Yes, I would like to reintroduce a topic, and that is the proprietary software that is being used in Members' offices. I think those of us with Members' papers are very concerned about this because we don't always have the IT support staff to work with the records that we may get from the offices where there is such software. I think for those institutions that are even smaller than mine, that that is a critical thing to be thinking about, where we may lose information because they don't have the kind of support they need to access the electronic records.

HAAS: Sheryl, this is Karen. I think that is an excellent point, and I am glad you raised it again. I think at one of my first meetings last Congress with the Advisory Committee you raised this issue, and we took it back to the House Administration Committee and put it on their radar. There hasn't been a lot of effort put into it, and I think it is something that we need to all regroup on and talk about. We have had some initial conversations, and I do think there is an interest in the House. And I think we should all work together to see what kind of progress we can make in that area.

VOGT: Thank you. I know that we have recently had some of our ACSC members who have been dealing with this more aggressively than some of the rest of us, and it has cost them quite a bit of money. I know one mentioned that it cost around \$10,000 to get the kind of conversion where they can make the information accessible and usable by researchers and even by their own staff. So they have actually been talking with the Congressional Papers Roundtable group and also with ACSC. I think if we brought these three groups together to try to move forward on this, that would be a good, collaborative thing for all three groups.

HAAS: Well, why don't we add that as an agenda item for one of our future meetings? And we will try to do some work leading up to the next meeting so we can report.

FERRIERO: Can I just add to the conversation that the Archives has issued, along with OMB, a directive to the Federal agencies around records management within which we spell out certain requirements for all the agencies, but also a set of promises about what the Archives is going to do to support their work. And one of those promises is working with the records management industry to create the tools, open-source tools, for the agencies to use to capture their records.

HAAS: Oh, excellent.

FERRIERO: So we need to work together on that, because whatever we create should be available to Congress at the same time.

HAAS: That is excellent.

LEON: I might just add at this point that if we are thinking about the next 5 years and pushing materials out into the world in a way that is usable, I think we definitely need to think about a way for both the House and the Senate and the National Archives to keep their eyes focused on open data for this particular set of records because of the number of people associated with it and the number of entities. The authority file entities associated with this batch of records is ripe for setting up in a linked open data system, which means that anything associated anywhere on the world on the Web with a particular Member or a particular committee can be accessed in one fell swoop. And we have an awful lot of entities that we could be playing with, and we should figure out how to do that.

HAAS: Good point. John?

LAWRENCE: Well, first, I would like to thank everybody for welcoming me as a member of the committee. And, Nancy, thank you for your work. I did make it to the Senate floor on my last day -- the first time in 38 years I made it to the Senate floor for a tour. But I appreciate the offer. But thank you to everybody for welcoming me, and I hope that one of the things I can do is to bring the perspective of somebody who was both a House staff person and leadership staff person with a pretty strong eye towards my concerns about adequate recordkeeping, which I tried to impress particularly on the Pelosi staff from the beginning.

I may have some practical expertise even though I don't have nearly the technical background or expertise of most of the people on the committee. But I might have some practical benefits that I can offer. One of the things I want to do is offer myself to talk with the staffs and hopefully make perhaps that link between the practicalities of what we are trying to do here and the kinds of pressures that they may face.

I am particularly struck by the challenges that Robin and Karen face with the House because of the large numbers of Members, the higher turnover, both the staff but also Members. You know, a lot of people don't realize that in a normal House election, even though you may have a very high retention rate in the number of Members who are seeking reelection, you still could have 60, 70, 80 Members who are coming and going. And not all House Members enter office with the same expectations of immortality as Senators, and so they pay a little less attention to recordkeeping.

The one question I want to ask which -- the word I haven't heard here, and I say this with admission of virtually complete ignorance -- I hear a lot of emphasis on Members and a lot of emphasis on committees, and I really am concerned about leadership, because individual

Members, in some cases, painful as it is to say, may have less impact on the overall scope of history than either a committee or leadership.

And I mention this both because I want to know what is going on, and also because, particularly when we talk about things like electronic records, I know there is huge sensitivity about granting access to anything that is remotely current. Certainly in the electronic records I left behind, there was a fair amount of information there which people are understandably very sensitive about where it is going and who is having access to it. And to the extent to which they are not completely familiar that there are confidentiality arrangements or there are accessibility restrictions that protect them, that probably discourages full cooperation.

And it may be a much greater issue, I certainly suspect as having been the staff director of two committees before I became the chief of staff to the Speaker, that there is a lot more sensitivity at the leadership level than there is at the committee level, where records are known to be public documents and people cannot just pick them and take them, the way they can with Member offices.

So I just wonder on the leadership issue, where that is in terms of a priority and whether there are practical aspects of that. I mention that because, you know, there is always the possibility of leadership turnover. And what is lost there, as opposed to losses in an individual office, can be very considerable from a historiographic standpoint.

HAAS: Absolutely. Robin, do you want to speak a little bit to what we are doing in the House?

REEDER: Absolutely.

We have had outreach, I know, in the past to leadership offices because we consider the leadership papers part of the papers of the Member when they leave. Say, with the Speaker -- I know we met with Leader Pelosi's office in the past, as well, about the leadership papers.

And we have worked also with the current Speaker's office to have them recognize that, even though the leadership papers are kind of in between -- they are not official records of the House under the House rules, but they are considered more than just Members' papers -- that they are an important part of telling the story and that they are important to retain.

HAAS: John, I think it is a really important issue that you brought up, because it is a little bit of a gray area. Over the years with leadership, it tends to be towards the end of tenure, and not the beginning, that archiving is thought of. And it is one of the things -- on the Members side, I think we really stepped it up and we are doing a really good job there. I think we also need to look at new leadership as they enter the world of leadership and make sure we are reaching out to them early.

And then, as Robin pointed out, there also is this gray area of, where do the papers go? And I know conference and caucus records, for example, are really important, especially for reference points down the road. So it is something we need to devote some more time to and really would welcome your thoughts in that area.

LAWRENCE: If I can be of help with that, I would really like to.

HAAS: Thank you.

LAWRENCE: I have reasonably good relations with people. And I understand the nebulous area that leadership is. But we all recognize there is a world of difference between a Member's records or a Member if they happen to be Leader, Whip, or Speaker.

HAAS: Absolutely.

LAWRENCE: I just don't want to lose any opportunity to reach out there. So if I can be of help, consider that an offer.

HAAS: Thank you.

FERRIERO: Would that include your 48 legal pads of notes?

LAWRENCE: At the appropriate time.

HAAS: Don't?

RITCHIE: You know, we talk so much about how many records there are, and we are actually also in the business of creating records through oral history. And that is one way in which leadership positions, in particular, have been thought of. I know the House Historical Office is doing it. Our office has been doing it a lot more. And we are actually getting inquiries from committees when chairmen are leaving because key staff members are leaving after many years and suggesting that we do interviews. Because that is the best time to do an interview, is when somebody really wants to.

HAAS: Yes.

RITCHIE: Usually there is a debriefing type of process. So we have also added to the record in that way. And all of our interviews do go to the National Archives, along with the records of the committees.

I just wanted to add one other item, and Nancy brought this up before, and that is that the Senate is a very traditional institution. We really did something absolutely new in the Senate Historical Office last week when we began to delve into social media. With authority from the Secretary and from the Rules Committee, we have begun to tweet. And, in fact, today's tweet was about this committee meeting, with a connection to the section on our Web site about archival records so that people understand that is one of the functions that we do.

We are doing this mostly to draw attention to what already exists on the Web site for the types of records that we have, both finding aides for where the Senators' records are, but also the oral histories and everything else. We realized we reached a point where we have almost saturated the field, and people who are even familiar with our Web site don't know what is in it and how to navigate within it. So we using this as a daily reminder of the diversity of the types of things that we do to draw people into it, and we are working with our Archivist to make sure that all of our social media will be preserved as well.

PAUL: Excellent.

THOMAS: Hello, Karen?

HAAS: Yes?

THOMAS: Jeff Thomas here. Getting back to the leadership, I think something that this committee could work on over the next 5 years is would be to talk about and deal with their email records. I know I go in to talk to offices and I mention email records, and you get deer-in-the-headlights looks from people, mainly because of the way that people use email. They tend to put their private posts in with their official work. I think some education is needed in this area perhaps, and this committee could look in the next 5 years on ways of doing that.

HAAS: Thank you, Jeff. I think that is an excellent idea.

Other thoughts? Well, let me thank again our folks that have been participating via telephone. Thomas, welcome. We are glad to have you.

MACKEY: Well, thank you very much. I find this very useful in terms of listening to the discussion and finding out what the issues are. And hopefully I can weigh in both between now and the next meeting through email and social media and help out as best I can.

HAAS: Well, we will be reaching out to you, so thank you so much. And, Jeff and Sheryl, we missed you, and thank for your participation.

Before I close, one, I want to publicly thank Sharon Leon for all of her help and her willingness to go another round as my representative on the committee. I really appreciate it.

And then I also want to thank Brandon sitting back there from the Archives, and Bob Reeves from my office for their help today with our first teleconference. Thank you for all the support. And this concludes our meeting. Thank you.

Whereupon, at 11:39 a.m., the meeting was concluded.