

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS  
MEETING 46  
JUNE 16, 2014  
CONGRESSIONAL MEETING ROOM SOUTH  
CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m.

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); 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 Chancellor, Information Technology, Nevada System of Higher Education).

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).

Ms. Haas. The meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress will come to order.

Let me begin by taking this opportunity to welcome our Board members back. We have Steven Zink, Sheryl Vogt, Sharon Leon, and Jeff Thomas. Good to see you all here. And thank you again for your continued service to this Advisory Committee.

I would also like to welcome our co-chair and Secretary of the Senate, Nancy Erickson. Nancy and I are fortunate that we get to work together on lots of issues up here, and I truly enjoy the partnership that we have. And I would also like to welcome David Ferreiro, the Archivist of the United States.

I am going to start off by highlighting just a few things that the Office of the Clerk has been involved in since we last met. As I mentioned in a previous meeting, some of our offices have moved from the Cannon House Office Building to the O'Neill Building. The staff that is

included in the move is the Office of Art and Archives staff, as well as the staff from our House Historian's Office. We will continue to maintain the storefront in the Cannon House Office Building to allow us to continue our archival and curatorial services to both Member offices and to committee staff.

We are also preparing for the end of the 113th Congress. At this point we currently have over 50 Members that will be departing the House that we are aware of who have either announced they are retiring or are seeking another office. So that is a big job for Robin and her staff as we continue consultations with those offices.

We have also made some progress in our correspondence management issue which we will discuss later in the meeting. And recently we participated in the annual World e-Parliament meeting in South Korea. These meetings continue to focus on transparency in the legislative process, as well as the ability to share legislative documents.

At this time I would like to recognize the Secretary of the Senate for any comments she might have.

Ms. Erickson. Thank you, Karen.

I am pleased to report that the Senate continues to make progress in archiving our records and retrieving them for ongoing use.

In public presentations, the Senate has been commemorating the 50th anniversary of the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by offering a series of book talks, lectures, interviews, and a special Capitol tour. Our Senate Library hosted a talk by author Clay Risen, who discussed his book, *The Bill of the Century: The Epic Battle for the Civil Rights Act*. And I think it's fair to say -- Betty, you can correct me -- that the basic premise of his book was that LBJ's role in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has been overstated. Our historians offered brown-bag lunch talks on the Senate and civil rights, 1862 to 1963; civil rights proponents' strategy for success; and finally, cloture and final passage of the Civil Rights Act presented by

our historians Betty Koed, Mary Baumann, and Kate Scott.

On June 25<sup>th</sup>, at noon in the Kennedy Caucus Room, Senate Historian Don Ritchie will moderate a discussion with former *CBS* congressional correspondent Roger Mudd, and the *Herald Tribune's* congressional correspondent Andy Glass on the Civil Rights Act. You are all invited to this special event.

On June 27<sup>th</sup>, a special tour of Capitol spaces associated with the debate and passage of the act will be held.

Betty Koed has been representing Don Ritchie in his absence. Last week she literally held her audiences in suspense as we wondered if Majority Leader Mike Mansfield would get the 67<sup>th</sup> vote necessary to break cloture. I really appreciate Betty's leadership on this front. They have been a wonderful series.

Last Friday we had our Senate page pinning ceremony. I always talk to the pages about the importance, the significance, and the privilege of being on the Senate floor; that it is a privilege that they should never take for granted. And even in my 8<sup>th</sup> year as Secretary, I continue to feel a sense of awe every morning when I walk on the floor. I feel as though this girl from South Dakota should pinch myself in disbelief that I am on the Senate floor. And I often think about the giants that have served on that floor. After hearing Betty's lecture the past couple weeks, I thought about the Civil Rights Act giants: Majority Leader Mike Mansfield; Republican Leader Everett Dirksen; and then the floor managers of the bill, Senator Hubert Humphrey and Senator Tom Kuchel from California. So I hope you will all be able to join us, for those of you who are in town, for next week's interview that Don Ritchie will conduct with Roger Mudd and Andy Glass.

I would like to compliment Richard Hunt and his staff for providing us with such timely and excellent delivery and reference service. Because we do not have on-site storage space for noncurrent records, it is essential that we are able to continue to move newest accessions of Senate records to the Center promptly. The committees depend on being able to get records

back when necessary, and we hope this excellent service continues.

I especially want to thank Janet Davis, Sharon Fitzpatrick, Thomas Eisinger, and the Center's dedicated courier, Donald Collier. Donald is a particular favorite with committee staff when he promptly arrives to remove boxes from crowded offices.

Our steady growth in archiving electronic records is heavily dependent on the ability to make regular transfers and move records quickly when necessary. Elisabeth Butler, Deputy Archivist, has worked with Thomas Eisinger to implement electronic transfer of our accessioning records. Both Brandon Hirsch and Shannon Niou of the Center's staff provide excellent support for our routine transfer of electronic files. We are hoping to be able to accession classified electronic records in the near future, and I hope we will get an update today from Richard Hunt on the Center's progress on that front.

I look forward to our discussion this morning, especially the update on possible options to address the space issues at the Center for Legislative Archives.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Nancy.

At this time I would like to recognize David Ferreiro, Archivist of the United States.

Mr. Ferreiro. Thank you, Karen, and good morning. Since we last met, I have a number of things to report.

The National Declassification Center, which was charged by an Executive Order to review what we thought was 400 million pages of classified content going back to World War I, finished its work on-time on December 31st, 2013. It turned out to be 351 million pages rather than 400 million, which was an accomplishment in itself for identifying exactly the magnitude of the problem. The most important thing that came out of this exercise was the establishment of a process that will be used to streamline the declassification endeavor in the future.

As I said, we have reviewed all of the 351 million pages. We now have a lot of work ahead of

us in terms of the archival work necessary to make them available for use, but I am really proud of the work that the staff did to get us to this point. Some of those documents, as you probably know, dating back to World War I had things like formulas for secret ink that the CIA had classified for many years. So it was an interesting process.

We have issued our strategic plan. I will make sure that you have the link in the Minutes so that you can take a look at it, or you can go to our website archives.gov.

([http://www.nara-at-work.gov/strategic\\_planning\\_and\\_reporting/strategic-plan.html](http://www.nara-at-work.gov/strategic_planning_and_reporting/strategic-plan.html))

There are four very concise goals: Make access happen, connect with customers, maximize our value to the Nation, and, most important to me, build our future through our staff; a commitment to give the staff the resources they need to do their work. I am also very proud of this document. I inherited a strategic plan of about 48 pages with 23 goals. This is 21 pages with 4 goals.

Last Friday we celebrated the first birthday of *Founders Online*, which created the ability to search across the papers of the Founding Fathers for the first time. So far we have had 450,000 viewers, which I am also very proud of. It is an incredibly useful product that the National Historical Publications and Records Commission has made possible. So if you haven't seen *Founders Online* yet, give it a whirl.

Speaking of civil rights, the LBJ Library recently convened a 3-day summit celebrating LBJ's role in civil rights legislation. You know, the irony is we had four Presidents and two First Ladies present. It was an incredibly historic event. I had the opportunity to introduce President Carter at this event and as I was introducing him, they flashed up on the screen a letter that I wrote to President Johnson, congratulating him for signing President Kennedy's civil rights bill. You will be hearing more about that as the summaries of those sessions come out. It was a great event.

We had our very first sleepover in the rotunda of the National Archives in January. A hundred kids and their parents spent the night with us.

One of the highlights for me every year is the “Archivist’s Awards”, a special ceremony we have to recognize staff accomplishments. We have moved the ceremony to coincide with Public Service Recognition Week. There are number of awards you should know about because they involve folks that you know. Rod Ross received a lifetime achievement award for his exemplary service as a reference archivist for 38 years. Martha Grove got an award for her role in helping launch our new *Records of Rights* permanent exhibit in the David Rubenstein Gallery; and Jacqie Ferry and Brandon Hirsch earned awards for their work with House and Senate archivists to create the integrated accessioning and transfer system using Archivists' Toolkit. I am very proud of those accomplishments.

And finally, I am always interested in eyes on our content; you know, how can we get our content in front of the world? Recent data was presented to me for a snapshot of 2013. In 2013, we had about 7 million hits on our online catalog, which sounds pretty good. But more importantly, in Wikipedia there are 4,000 articles that have National Archives content, and those 4,000 articles alone had 1.3 billion hits. So that gives you a sense of the power of the Internet to get our records out there to people.

That is all for me.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

At this time I would like to recognize Matt Wasniewski, the House Historian.

Mr. Wasniewski. Thanks, Karen. Our offices do great work together, and I am pleased to highlight the completion of two projects that I talked about at our December 2013 meeting, both of which were done collaboratively. The Historian's Office researched and wrote them, and the Clerk's Office of History and Preservation provided information, bibliographic information, manuscript information, and images. And the Clerk's Communications Office designed both. Most everyone at the table should have copies here at their seats.

In January we published a booklet-length history of the House Page Program, which, of course,

dates back to the early 1800s. It was distributed to Member offices with a “dear colleague letter”. It is available on our Web site, and downloadable in a high-resolution PDF. There are accompanying oral histories with it. This was a study commissioned by the House leadership when the program closed in 2011.

In mid-April, GPO published our volume of *Hispanic Americans in Congress*, with a copy also at everyone's place. This volume dates from 1822 to 2012. It was distributed to Member offices on both sides of the Capitol. The book profiles 91 Hispanic Americans who served in the Congress from the very first member, Joseph Marion Hernandez, who was a delegate from Florida in 1822, through the freshman Members of the 112th. And like the other books in this series on women and African Americans, it has contextual essays, historic data, and tables at the end in the appendices. The entire publication is available on our history Web site, which is updated and current through the 113th Congress.

I am pleased to note that reference copies of this have gone out to a number of offices, as well as the predecessor volumes about women and African Americans in Congress. We sent copies to congressional paper repositories, State historical societies, eager teachers who were contacted through the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, the Society of American Archivists Congressional Papers Roundtable, and to Charlie Flanagan at the Center for Legislative Archives. I am happy to report that late this summer, the Historian's Office is going to be participating at the Library of Congress' National Book Festival, where we are going to make our publications available to teachers.

And not to be outdone on the 1964 Civil Rights Act, there is a House component to this, too. At the end of June, we are going to launch an essay using historic documents that the Center has provided us that tell the House side of the story including the role of Bill McCulloch, ranking member of the Judiciary Committee, and Chairman Emanuel Celler, and theirs role in helping bring the bill to fruition.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Matt. At this point it is time for approval of the minutes. Is there an objection to dispensing with the reading of the minutes?

Hearing none, are there any corrections to the minutes from our last meeting?

No corrections? Okay. I will entertain a motion, then, to approve the minutes.

Mr. Ferreiro. So moved.

Ms. Haas. Second?

Mr. Wasniewski. Second.

Ms. Haas. Those in favor?

Motion carries. Minutes are approved.

As I mentioned earlier, during our last two Advisory Committee meetings, we talked about the correspondence management systems used in Member offices and the difficulty of transferring records to repositories by retiring Members of Congress. At this time I would like to recognize Bob Reeves, the Deputy Clerk, who will update the committee on the progress we have made since our last meeting.

Mr. Reeves. Thank you, Karen.

After the last meeting, we reached out to the Committee on House Administration. They helped us set up a meeting with the CMS vendors so that we could discuss what we were looking for. At the meeting one of the larger vendors discussed the House interchange standard, which is the format that currently shares electronic data. Essentially, it was developed to be able to exchange data between the various vendors so that if a Member wanted to change to a new vendor, a file could be created, and they could then import it into their new system. So it was really a way of exchanging data between the Members.

During the discussion that we had with this larger vendor, we learned that they have created an alternate Access database format that they are willing to provide. During the discussion we asked them if we could have a demo of their product, because we had not seen the CMS product, and also if they could provide us more information on their Access database.



At the second meeting that we had with them, we went through the application. They showed us how it worked and the data that it provided. It gave us a good understanding of all the information that is being collected. I think the other thing it provided for our Office of Arts and Archives and the Historian's Office was a better understanding about how to archive data when they discuss archiving with Members.

The second part of that meeting was a further discussion of the Access database, and the vendor is very interested in receiving feedback on this Access database. If you are interested in participating in giving feedback to the vendor, I have information. If you see me after the meeting, I can give you a disk with the information on it, and we can start the process of reviewing what this one particular vendor has available. Our goal going forward is to see what comes out of this review process, but then to continue to work with CHA, the other CMS vendors, and the committee to see what the next step will be to take to make this data more accessible to you. Questions?

Ms. Haas. Steve.

Mr. Zink. I have one question. When you say Access database, you are talking about Microsoft?

Mr. Reeves. I am sorry, yes. Microsoft Access database.

Mr. Zink. I wanted to make sure it wasn't generic.

Ms. Haas. A couple things to add, if I could. I think one of the things Bob mentioned that for me was a real positive, since we know how active Robin's folks are meeting with Member offices in preparation for their departure, is the level of communication with the vendors. Getting feedback allows us to continue to work more effectively with Member offices. And as I mentioned, we have a lot of departing Members, so this is something we are going to continue to work on in the next several months as this Congress comes to a close.

Ms. Vogt. I just wanted to say I am very glad that you have had this discussion, because we have been very interested in this at the Russell Library. For the first time since we have been working with electronic records, I have someone in a position who really knows how to deal with electronic records and has the training to work with them. And she can actually take an ASCII file and establish a database that we can then use for searches. It has been extremely helpful to see how that might work for us.

We have had other offices that their records have come exported as PDFs, and also some Word documents, and that aren't easy to use. We have been in a situation where we didn't know what to ask for because we didn't have the expertise to know what to ask for from the vendors, and also we didn't know what they might be willing to share. This will be helpful information for us. I am fortunate because I do have a person working with us who understands electronic records. In most institutions across the Nation, they do not have an IT person to work with them to create the kind of database that our person has created, or even to ask the kind of questions that she is able to ask. She has created a list of fields that we would be interested in, but in order to be effective we have to know what fields offices are using, know which ones we would like to have, and also make sure we don't get fields that have information such as Social Security numbers and so on. We might be able to weed some of that out before it ever comes to us. So I think it is wonderful we can start this discussion.

Ms. Haas. Thank you very much.

Ms. Paul. Yes. I think this would be a good point for me to chime in on the CSS systems. The Congressional Papers Roundtable of the Society of American Archivists is holding its annual meeting here at the Visitor Center on August 13th. The program includes software demonstrations by CSS systems reps to explain modules commonly used by Members' offices, including program functions, capabilities, and dependencies. This will be followed by a presentation by the Robert Byrd Center and the Albert Gore Center on their efforts to make the CSS data usable in an archival environment. The Roundtable meeting is open to all who are interested. One does not need to be a member of the Society of American Archivists to attend. So we certainly invite staff from the House to attend this Roundtable forum scheduled for

Wednesday, August 13th.

I wanted to add that further investigation into the use of CSS systems is gaining urgency as we recently have discovered that some offices are using the systems for much more than they were originally designed; that is, to handle constituent mail and casework. They are being utilized to hold information that normally would reside on an office shared drive such as briefing materials, accomplishments reports, events summaries, meeting summaries and so forth, that document the essential activities of an office.

So given these difficulties and the expense of handling this data that currently is transferred to an archive, I think it is imperative that we continue to investigate use in the offices. I think it is developing rapidly. We need to document this new use of the systems, and we should seek a seat at the table when vendor contracts are renewed during the next cycle.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Karen.

Any other comments? Bob, thank you.

At this time I would like to recognize Karen Paul for an update on activities in the Senate.

Ms. Paul. Thank you.

Senator Baucus retired in February to become Ambassador to China, and archivist Marie Carr did a wonderful job of pulling the 1,000-box collection together despite a truncated time frame for closing the office. He is donating his collection to the University of Montana, where a Baucus Institute for Public Policy and Service is planned. As chair of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator Baucus strongly supported the preservation of the committee's history. Under his chairmanship, and that of ranking member Senator Grassley, the committee was one of the first to begin transferring electronic records and email to the Center. The committee also has had a staff archivist for a number of years, a tradition that was begun by Senators Moynihan and Roth.

Senator Baucus' retirement led to committee chairmen musical chairs, as Senator Wyden moved to Finance, Senator Landrieu to Energy, Senator Cantwell to Small Business, and Senator Tester to Indian Affairs. Anticipating all of the staff shuffling that would result, we reached out aggressively to these committees, well before the chairmen moved, to secure departing staff records. For electronic records, we are definitely moving away from archiving once a Congress to archiving in anticipation of staff moving. That has been a big change for us and the way that we are handling our archiving and collection process.

We will have four chairmen retiring at the end of this Congress, and we will be facing similar challenges. Our office processing backlog -- because we are handling directly the records of eight committees that do not have archivists -- has continued to grow, and we have obtained additional help from archival graduate student interns. We currently have seven Members retiring at the end of the Congress, and to date five have selected a repository.

I am very pleased to announce that we have a new Budget Committee archivist, Katie Smith, who interned in our office 5 years ago, and then joined Senator Lieberman's staff. As Senator Lieberman's archivist, she convinced him to preserve all of his email -- which many of the Members do not do -- both his personal email which went to the Library of Congress, and his Homeland Security chairman's email which went to the Center.

I would like to report next on our accessioning project. At our last meeting I described the work that Deputy Archivist Alison White and Jacqie Ferry of the Center had done on phase two of the project. The new form was launched in January and is used to import accession records that include name and subject tags into Archivists' Toolkit. The one form is used for all types of records, both textual and electronic, and we are very excited at how well we can handle electronic record description with the toolkit, and how we can now link accessions using these name and subject records.

This has such exciting possibilities for the future when these records open because what we are seeing in processing the electronic records is that when a major bill comes to the floor, it seems like the whole Senate stops what they are doing, and everybody kind of works on the bill. So

what these name and subject tags are going to do is link different committees that don't have jurisdiction, but that are playing an essential role in the bill. So this is truly, I think, going to revolutionize research in electronic records.

Also, staff in the Senate Archivist's Office do some additional data entry in order to capture records for significant contributors; for example, if there is a lot of email from a senator in the collection we capture people, organizations, topics, titles of legislation, and geographic terms. Another example would be if there is a lot about a particular state in the records, we make note of that, and also documents and file types. So the back end of the form captures the information in XML, and we then perform an XSLT transformation using a style sheet. The form generates robust metadata that will remain part of the description of these records from now on, and should help future researchers and the National Archives reference staff determine accurately and efficiently which records will meet research needs.

We have been working on a social media preservation project. Last fall we established a working group with the Senate Sergeant at Arms Technology Assessment Group to evaluate social media preservation tools. During March, team members met with several vendors and selected four products to test. We are presently nearing the end of a 60-day trial of these products. A final evaluation of the test results is scheduled for July, and we are hoping to obtain Senate contracts with one or two of the companies so that their products will be available to Senate offices.

Over the winter we worked on some new records policy guidance. Working closely with committee and Members' systems administrators, and Senate Sergeant at Arms Enterprise Process staff, we developed new guidance aimed at retrieving lost and deleted files. The need for this guidance became apparent from our own committee electronic records processing, and the extent of the need by others was revealed during candid discussions at our Archives brown bag meetings. I think this guidance certainly represents a milestone in terms of the development of the Senate Archives policies and ability to preserve the records.

We have been involved in a number of areas in training and outreach. "Catching Up and

Keeping Up" was the theme of our winter brown bag, which focused on ways offices can get caught up with their archiving tasks, and presented tips for keeping up, particularly with technology. These themed discussions have borne good fruit, and we have begun filming and posting them on our Intranet for staff that cannot attend the actual meetings.

In April, we celebrated Congress Week, founded by the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress five years ago as a way to celebrate the history and records of Congress. Our presentation was "Congress at 225 Years: Where it all Began." The Center's education specialist Christine Blackerby, and Charlene Bickford, editor of the First Federal Congress Project, documented treasures from the First Congress. Historian Fergus Bordewich commented on his research with these documents and compared them with contemporary records. His observations about the need to preserve electronic records provided some nice reinforcement. C-SPAN 3 covered the presentation, and it can be viewed on the C-SPAN archive.

Robin Reeder and I hosted a "Treasures of Congress Archives Open House" for new Members and their families in December. The open house featured a close-up look at some treasures for the adults and hands-on activities for children. The idea was to engage family members in how they could preserve Senate history. The event was also sponsored by the ACSC, which kindly provided the refreshments, and the U.S. Association of Former Members of Congress. We thank them for their help with this, and we are planning to hold this open house for new Members and their families every other year.

We continue to reach out to Members, their families, and their staff in some new ways by partnering with our traditional as well as some newer friends. We are always looking for good ideas on ways to reach out so please let us know if you have any. And I have already written down a sleepover.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Karen.

At this time I would like to recognize Robin Reeder, the House Archivist, for an update on

House activities. Robin.

Ms. Reeder. Thank you, Karen.

Since the December meeting, Archives staff has been focused on long-term and ongoing projects, as well as planning for upcoming projects. We updated our Members' Records Management Manual in February. You all have copies with your packets. The last edition of the manual was published back in 2006. The content and design of the manual was completely updated to make it more readable and user friendly, and the new design also matches the updated design of our Records Management Manual for Committees. In this manual there is expanded guidance on preserving electronic records, color-coded disposition guidelines to make it easier to see what to retain and review, and an expanded list of additional resources to consult.

Also, news for our office. We have been interviewing candidates for a new photo archivist position available in the Office of Art and Archives. This person will be responsible for managing the vast amount of images from the House collection and the Historian's Office, as well as fielding image requests and providing information on image rights. We hope to have someone in place in July.

For the last few years, we have been talking about our work on records schedules for all the Clerk's offices, and I am happy to say we completed that in May. I also mentioned at the last meeting that we have been working on remodeling our storage space in the Madison Building in anticipation of our move to the O'Neill Building. This space is totally completed and we are able to work there quite comfortably. We have nice, new carpeting, unlike the orange 1972 carpeting that was in there.

Also mentioned at our last meeting was that the Archives part of Art and Archives created a formal policies and procedures document, and we continue updating the document as we encounter new issues and challenges raised by the unique nature of congressional records. Alison Trulock from our office, as well as Albin Kowalewski from the Historian's Office, were accepted and will be attending the 2014 Institute for the Editing of Historical Documents,

which will take place in Louisville, Kentucky, in July.

We have continued partnering with the House Learning Center to teach classes on records management to House staff. Heather Bourk has taught four classes since our last Advisory Committee meeting on committee records management. Alison Trulock has taught four classes on records management for Members' offices. This has been a really great way to reach out to offices and has actually resulted in more one-on-one meetings afterwards, too. With the end of the Congress nearing, we are continuing to participate in the transition briefings that the Chief Administrative Officer's office holds for Members' offices that are closing at the end of the year. This is a great way for us to emphasize our records management guidance. The first meeting took place on June 6th, and there will be one briefing a month held until the November election, and one offered to staff of Members who lost in the general election the week after the election. The CAO's office has a transition Web site that has information, including our contact information.

Here are some brief statistics from the last time we met. We have had 17 Member consultations. This is a little lower than this time last Congress, but we expect the numbers to increase as the end of the Congress gets closer. Textual records transferred through us is 370,500 pages, which is actually more than this time last Congress, which was 271,500 pages. We have transferred 299 gigabytes of electronic records. Loans to committees is 89,250 pages, which is actually much more than the 33,700 this time last Congress.

And I just want to give a shout-out to my colleague Alison Trulock. She did the bulk of the planning for today's meeting and logistics. Thank you, Alison.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Robin. Thanks, Alison.

Before we get to Richard Hunt's annual report, we have three speakers from the National Archives to hear from. The first is Jay Bosanko, the Chief Operating Officer for the National Archives, who will update us on the agency's issues regarding space. Jay?



Mr. Bosanko. Good morning. Thank you. I appreciate the opportunity again to come talk to you about our space challenges, and to share with you the latest thinking that we have been working on since the last meeting.

At the last meeting I mentioned that our working group of NARA staff, including representatives from the Center for Legislative Records, had identified several storage options late last year. We have since considered them, and have otherwise been working to determine their feasibility, especially in the context of budgetary and other constraints. Simply moving records from one existing NARA location to another does not provide a viable solution, especially given the broader space challenges currently faced by NARA and the expected future growth of House and Senate records. We are still refining our numbers, but the Center projects a need for more than 60,000 cubic feet of additional storage space by 2030. And we have determined that NARA needs more than a million cubic feet of storage by that same date.

Ms. Erickson. Jay, can you repeat the date?

Mr. Bosanko. 2030. Too often in the past when NARA has dealt with space challenges, there has been a tendency to look for a short-term solution to solve the challenge just to get around the next corner. So we tend to focus on a 3- to 5-year time frame. I want to be in a position where we are looking far enough out that we weren't constantly addressing the problems when we hit 2030. The working group nonetheless considered both short-term and long-term solutions. The short-term solutions they identified were to accommodate a minimum of 3 years of congressional records growth, requiring an additional 12,000 cubic feet of records-storage space. I will explain a couple of the more viable options they identified, but don't get too excited.

One option considered the leasing and conversion of existing space at a downsizing Federal agency reasonably close to the Capitol itself. One of the candidates for this conversion would yield 10,000 cubic feet, so not quite enough to meet the total need. It would require approximately 6 to 8 months before it would be ready to house records; and require an estimated one-time cost of at least \$200,000 for shelving, and an annual estimated rental cost of

at least \$87,500. However, a multi-tenant arrangement such as this carries certain risks to archival holdings such as water, chemicals, and environmental conditions. In other words, we wouldn't be the sole tenant. Another agency would also be using the building, and their activities could place our holdings at risk.

This is a policy that under our storage requirements we allow, but we don't encourage, and we don't do ourselves. In those cases, in order to store archival records in that type of situation, we require a joint use agreement to attempt to limit threats to the holdings. The space that was identified, we have learned since the report was done, would be available for 5 years because of the way contracts and interagency agreements would work. So you would have a base agreement with four 1-year extensions. This would truly be a short-term solution.

Another option would be to utilize existing private-sector storage and service providers to meet the existing NARA standards. There are several vendors that have excess capacity that meet our standards. The pros for that option is that you don't have to wait for new construction. There is a lot of flexibility with volume, but, again, it is a private-sector storage environment and private-sector-provided servicing.

Another option that was examined was existing space at the National Archives at College Park. We have some lab space that could potentially be converted into shelved archival space. There is still a lot more work to be done, but we believe that could yield 30,000 cubic feet of storage space, take up to 6 to 8 months to build, but would cost more than \$1.2 million for mechanical upgrade and shelving.

We have been monitoring GSA lease space in the region to see if any records-storage facilities are coming on the market, but to date we haven't identified any viable facilities. Our discussions with GSA indicate that suitable space is not expected to become available in the foreseeable future.

Long-term options identified by the working group included the construction of two expansion modules at the National Archives at College Park. When that facility was built, the original

design included two pods or modules that could be added on to the existing building. We have conceptual drawings of what those would look like. This could yield over a million cubic feet of records-storage space; however, construction costs would be at least \$225 million to add those pods.

Another long-term option considered by the working group was to construct a new stand-alone records-storage facility in the National Capital region that would meet both legislative and executive branch needs with respect to archival holdings, but the land and building costs associated would have to be determined by each branch.

However, none of these long-term options are truly feasible in the current budget climate. And there is a number of regulations that determine how departments and agencies acquire and use real property that would pose significant challenges as well. So as you can see, the way forward requires additional consideration of these proposed options, as well as additional options.

We are currently working to better identify our own storage needs and are committed to finding appropriate, cost-effective solutions. We appreciate the committee's offer of assistance in this challenging effort, and any options we would consider, or in particular be able to advance concerning new space, would definitely require your input. While it is always frustrating to say something like this, we likely can't limit our discussions to just these meetings. The timing and the environment makes it challenging. So I would like to propose that we start working beyond these formal meetings.

So where does this leave us? A long time ago I was taught to always make sure I had something to offer even when I didn't really have something to offer. So we do have one option that is on the horizon and is feasible, and would be available by the end of the year, which is when we are out of space. However, we understand that to date you haven't generally supported the storing and servicing of congressional records at a location outside the National Capital region. This is an option that we need you to spend some time considering.

We expect to have some new space available in the Kansas City, Missouri area by the end of the year. This is likely the last of new space that we expect to have available. We need your assistance to work with the Center to determine if we can identify records that are not yet available for use by researchers, or known to not likely be needed for active use by the House and Senate, and possibly shift some of those records to this new space. That would allow us to keep the new space that we have built out over the last couple years to be used for records that are available for active research, and otherwise needed to support the immediate needs of the House and Senate.

Ms. Erickson. What do you mean by the space you currently built out? Where?

Mr. Bosanko. The space we built for the Center. In the last couple years we have added more than 4,000 cubic feet in additional shelving in existing stack areas. But the problem is we have literally gotten to the point where we are building out in alcoves and little tiny spaces. So we have a certain footprint that is available for the storage of House and Senate records. There is still some excess capacity there, but Richard's team believes that that will be gone by the end of the year. .

We have no other space in the D.C. area. With the new space coming online in Kansas City, one solution would be to identify records that we know, because of House and Senate rules, won't be available for researcher use, and shift those to this facility, or records that, while they are open, they are almost never used. I think with a combination of subject-matter expertise from the Center and all of you, we might be able to identify some records that could be moved off-site, that could be returned if needed, and that just wouldn't have the close proximity and the service that we are able to provide right now.

Ms. Haas. Okay.

Mr. Bosanko. It is very sobering, I know.

Ms. Haas. I think we are all frustrated, including yourself I am sure, that we are having to deal

with the concern of lack of space for legislative records in a really condensed time period at this point. So a couple questions, if I could. First, the working group, is their work considered complete at this point?

Mr. Bosanko. They have identified and brought forward the options that they thought were viable.

Ms. Haas. Okay.

Mr. Bosanko. There is really nothing for them to do unless we have something more concrete with respect to a budgetary way to move forward with some of those options. If we became aware of something new that would meet the needs, we have the ability to put this together now, and we could bring the group together very quickly if something new showed up.

Ms. Haas. Okay. As far as this Kansas City option, are you looking at something similar for executive branch documents?

Mr. Bosanko. Yes. I probably didn't do a good enough job painting how dire it has become. So we are currently -- to give you an example and this impacts you as well -- providing courtesy storage for Members at the Washington National Records Center. The Washington National Records Center, and some of you have visited there in the past, is currently so full you really can't walk down the aisles very well. What we have started doing is taking records that would normally be stored at that facility to a facility in Pennsylvania and a facility in Massachusetts, because as agencies are archiving their last 30 years' worth of textual records, it has become overwhelming. And in order to keep Members' personal papers at WNRC that has been our solution.

We need more than a million cubic feet of space by 2030 for executive branch department and agency records. We are at the point right now where we have hundreds of thousands of cubic feet that are sitting at the agencies that we cannot bring in to NARA. We don't have room for the records now. So we are essentially still bringing records in, but we can't bring everything

that should be here today. We have several hundred thousand cubic feet that should have already been across the threshold that we are unable to bring in. So you are actually -- this isn't going to be comforting, but you are in better shape in that we haven't turned the spigot off for you yet.

Ms. Erickson. I would be just curious about what has been the rationale of OMB and our appropriators when you brought this issue to them?

Mr. Ferreiro. No increase in footprint.

Ms. Erickson. No way?

Mr. Ferreiro. That is why I really support Jay's suggestion that we form a working group so that we can use some leverage here to support the case.

Ms. Haas. Well, I am supportive of a working group. I think that that is a positive step. I would like us to have timetables attached to that so that we can show some progress since we brought the issue up at the last meeting. You have some feedback or a report from the working group, but there are no solutions that are obvious. Kansas City is a possible option, but we need to find a solution to this problem. And to your point, it is an ongoing one, and we can't just look for a short-term fix or a Band-Aid fix. We need a long-term plan.

Matt, did you have a question?

Mr. Wasniewski. Yes. I just had a couple questions. I understand that you can identify records that are closed for a certain amount of time, and you are answering the public aspect of access. But what about if a committee needs its records? What kind of turnaround would you have?

And then related to that, whether it is Kansas City, or whether it is a second facility here in D.C., what kind of strain is that going to place on the Center for Legislative Archives in terms of staffing to serve those records?

Mr. Bosanko. So the staffing issue isn't really nearly as big of a challenge. From a staffing perspective, we have the flexibility both in the field and here to add capability. Real property and the costs associated with it are much higher burden. And to be clear, it is not something that is within our discretion. These are not decisions that we are choosing to not make in order to meet your needs.

But as far as the service delivery, I would point to the personal papers of Members that are stored across the country. We would be providing at least that same quality of service, if not better. We have 27 million cubic feet of records in storage across the United States, and we have a pretty good track record of meeting the executive department and agencies' needs to provide them with records, whether it is to the law enforcement and intelligence agencies to meet ongoing and existing threats, or whether it is to agencies like the IRS that service all of your personal tax records when you need or they need copies. This is what we do, and we for decades have had to do it from a regionally dispersed model.

We have adjusted ourselves. We have records that are served to the public today in New York that are stored in Kansas. We have the ability to shift records back. We can leverage overnight delivery service. And I will tell you, that is what the private sector does as well. The private-sector records-storage environment does it whether it is servicing the corporate needs of the private sector or when they provide service to Federal departments and agencies. We don't have the luxury of storing records within close proximity anymore. Iron Mountain, one private-sector vendor that is in northwestern Pennsylvania, provides 24-hour turnaround to their customers in this area.

While it is always comforting to know that you can pick up the phone and call Richard or Matt, and say we need these records, and somebody is going to throw them in the van and drive them up, the volume has outstripped, at least with our current infrastructure, our ability to continue to do that. But I would like to think that we can work with you to develop an understanding as far as what service we can provide. Right now you have an expectation and understanding of what we can provide out of the facility that is right down the road. Any other option, whether it is another one in the Washington, D.C., area, whether it is at College Park, whether it is

Kansas City, no matter what we do, you are going to have to have an expectation of what we can provide, and it probably won't be exactly the same as what we are giving you out of Archives I.

Ms. Haas. Steven?

Mr. Zink. I think the elephant in the room is something that we all experience, because as long as you are expecting paper and using paper, you are not going to outrun space needs. So the obvious question is, what is the limitation -- I mean, eventually you are going digital, one way or the other. When is the Archives hoping to reach a point when records are received in a native digital format?

Mr. Ferriero. 2019. That is the switchover.

Mr. Zink. But you are not going to make that.

Mr. Ferriero. The agencies will make it.

Mr. Zink. Yeah. But as far as space --

Mr. Ferriero. Yes, exactly. And that is the landscape that Jay just painted, the reason that we need 100 million cubic feet, to bring in what is sitting out there from now until that switchover.

Mr. Zink. And there is no -- you don't have the capability to --

Mr. Ferriero. Digitize before it is transferred? No.

Mr. Zink. Well, not before it is transferred. At some point eventually, rather than making these difficult choices on space, which is always going to be a problem. Eliminates time and space and lots of other things, but you don't have that capability?



Mr. Ferriero. Exactly. No.

Mr. Bosanko. The question that you are asking is something that in the last 6 months we have been struggling with. We have a variety of systems that we use to track what other Federal agencies are storing in our system, which is 27 million cubic feet, and look at them and paint the picture of what the landscape is going to look like going forward. Right now, executive branch departments and agencies are still creating textual records that they expect 100-year retention on. So one of the things that we have to do is -- and we are just starting to do it -- is look far in the future and find that point so we can start to shift behavior and how we work.

And, of course, part of a discussion around what is the solution for space means being able to have a very high level of confidence before we talk to either OMB or anybody at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue about what our needs are and what our model is. It doesn't do any good to say, "I need a million cubic feet of storage space," and we acquire that and solve that problem, and 10 years later say, "I need another million cubic feet." We need to be able to paint that picture.

And, Karen, that is part of what we have been doing for the last 6 months. We have been trying to understand the landscape so that when we are looking to solve the 60,000-cubic-foot problem for congressional records to meet demand by 2030, what does it mean for the 1.3 million cubic feet that we have to ask for NARA's executive branch agency needs.

Mr. Ferriero. And let me just impress upon you how difficult this data-gathering has been for Jay and his staff. Agencies are unable to tell us exactly what amount they have sitting out there. So there is a lot of estimating that has been going on, and I am not confident on the data.

Ms. Koed. Jay, I had a related question to the time to retrieve documents from Kansas City or wherever offsite. There is also the issue, of course, of various levels of classification. If you are dealing with the private sector, what sort of process and infrastructure is in place to deal with classified records that we don't now have a concern about in the current situation at Archives I?

Mr. Bosanko. The classified records stay here. We are not talking about moving any of the classified records. There is no capability that would meet our standards in the private sector for classified records. With the private-sector vendor, the challenge there more often than not, is a level of comfort. I will tell you from my interactions with other Federal agencies that are trying to decide whether to use the Federal Records Center program, or to use the capability that is out there in the private sector, is having a level of comfort storing records in a government facility versus a nongovernment facility.

I will tell you that very often in the private-sector facilities they manage their space under the premises that an open cubic foot is an open cubic foot, and it could hold anyone's records. So your ability to walk into a space and identify record ownership is much more challenging. They place them all over the facility and use IT to be able to put their hands on them. We use IT but we also tend to put all of our records in one place.

So there is a host of issues. Not only do we need to look at the service delivery, but there is the security of congressional records that aren't classified. The House and Senate have rules for keeping records closed for a particular period of time for a reason. We want to make sure that whatever solution we come up with can respect those.

But this is not something that is as simple as picking up the phone and saying somebody has to make more space available. Even internally, while we can make space available in Kansas City, there is a long list of questions that would need to be worked through to satisfy your concerns, Richard's concerns, and even our own internal concerns about what is where and what is our model.

We have had to make some decisions. We are making decisions right now about shipping records out of the Washington National Records Center in order to preserve the capability that we have there for permanent records and the personal papers that are stored there, but those aren't always the best decisions for the records or the best decisions from a financial standpoint. But we have no choice. We are sort of backed into that by the space crunch.

Mr. Hunt. Jay is right. The model is changing, because the model to date has been enhanced security at Archives I so that we, Center staff, are the only ones that have access to stack areas where House and Senate records are stored. And that was a great development over the last 10 years that gave us a higher degree of confidence that those records were protected from any intrusion. While we are National Archives employees, we view ourselves as the agents of the Clerk and the Secretary in the protection of your equities in those records, which are closed and very sensitive.

On the electronic records front, the model is we have those records stored locally in at Archives II now, soon to be at Archives I. But then they are duplicated and stored at Rocket Center in West Virginia. I remember, when we made that move, the kind of nondisclosure agreements that had to be signed by contract staff was very, very high from your institutions, much higher than the National Archives' typical nondisclosure agreement. We are going to have to figure out a way how we can do this together and protect all of our interests and equities.

Ms. Haas. Sheryl?

Ms. Vogt. In our new building we use the barcode system, so we don't have all collections integrally located on the shelf, and it works very well. I will say, staff who work in our stack area are usually so busy pulling records that there is no indication to them what would be closed or not closed records. It would be only the staff requesting the records that would know that by what we have made available through a finding aid. But that staff is under our direct supervision, so that does make a difference. And the other question I wanted to ask was, when you said no additional foot space, does that include the branches around the nation in Georgia or elsewhere?

Mr. Bosanko. That is a government-wide policy that has been put in place, where agencies freeze their footprint. This was to address a variety of challenges concerning excess property in inventory and issues like that. So, essentially, right now, if we want to be able to add capability, we have to take it away someplace else in the system. And that is the situation

faced by all departments and agencies.

Mr. Ferriero. That is another argument for us working together to make a case.

Ms. Vogt. My thought is if you could do it at a branch repository, it might be cheaper than trying to build here or make any kind of addition here.

Ms. Haas. Any other comments? Karen?

Ms. Paul. Have you considered modular shelving or movable shelving? "Compact" -- is that the correct term?

Mr. Bosanko. That is what we use at the National Archives at College Park and at our newer facilities. That is what we use to be able to squeeze as much as we can into the space that we have.

Ms. Paul. Would that be possible for Archives I?

Mr. Bosanko. It is not possible for Archives I.

Ms. Paul. Okay.

Mr. Bosanko. But it would be possible -- I believe that is part of the model -- for Kansas City. It comes down to what the floor loads can take and how level you can get the pour on the floor.

Ms. Vogt. What I was thinking is you might consider something like we have, which is the warehouse arrangement. Records are stored by the size of box, and then you retrieve them with a barcode. There is more storage space that way.

Mr. Bosanko. If I take my COO hat off and you forget about the budgetary restraints, what we would need would be an archival storage facility in the Washington, D.C. area. We don't need

to duplicate the overhead of a research facility -- we have research rooms at Archives I and Archives II. So it truly would be an archival storage facility where we could service records out of the existing research rooms and otherwise care for them. But that is not something that we are in a position to be able to do absent of overcoming the space limitations and the financial limitations.

Ms. Haas. Nancy, do you have any comments?

Ms. Erickson. No. I support the working group and agree with Karen that we need a timetable, a firm timetable, on getting back to this committee.

Ms. Haas. I would like to suggest that we have regular reporting as part of the working group. I think we should be anxious to participate, anxious to show some progress. Let us know how we can assist, but, as part of that, I would like us to be able to provide feedback to the rest of this group on how things are going, whether we are making progress or not, so people are aware of how things are going leading up to the end of this year. Okay?

Jay, thank you very much.

Mr. Bosanko. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Next, I would like to welcome to the table two staff members from the National Archives, who will update us on improvements underway to NARA's current online catalog with respect to congressional records: Natalie Rocchio, an archives specialist in digital outreach at the Center for Legislative Archives; and Kelly Osborn, a Web developer in the Office of Innovation.

Ms. Rocchio. Good morning. And thank you for giving us time to review and discuss the Center's new research portal with you today. Since the last meeting of the Advisory Committee, we have been working with the Office of Innovation in response to feedback that we have heard from our researchers and from our committee members. Some of the concerns that we heard at the first meeting we were able to fix, or implement changes immediately. For

example, the Center was added to the footer of archives.gov and we adjusted some of the cataloging through the Online Public Access system, or "OPA," as I will refer to it throughout this presentation, so that it was limited to our records only.

These were minor fixes, as we saw, and didn't really provide the full results that we were looking for in our office and for the Advisory Committee. So, since December, we have been working, as I said, with the Office of Innovation to come up with some solutions to these problems, and within the last 6 weeks we have been working to implement those improvements.

I would like to take the opportunity, before we get started with the presentation, to thank Kelly Osborn, who is sitting at the table here. She has been our liaison in the Office of Innovation and has been working as our Web developer to come up with some of these solutions for us. I would also like to thank Michael Lingenfelter, who works in the Office of Innovation, as well. We will be previewing some of the things he did to enhance our search functions on the Web site.

I would like to thank my colleague, Jacqie Ferry, at the Center, who helped me with a lot of the content for the portal pages. And I need to thank Brian Barth, who is the art director for the National Archives, who helped develop some of the logos and content that we use throughout the research portal and throughout our Web site. And finally, a thank you to all of the staff at the Center who took the time to preview and test out the search boxes and content as we developed the portal. I just want to say thank you to everyone for their help.

I would like start by walking you through some of the things that we have been working on. Because the site isn't live yet, we are going to use a PowerPoint with screenshots to show you the developments. We did have the opportunity to show Karen, Robin, Sharon, and Sheryl some live action on the server over the last 2 weeks, so they have seen our search capabilities in real time.

I want to begin with some basic information about our Web site and give you a screenshot of

the current situation on [archives.gov/legislative](http://archives.gov/legislative). We have very basic information relating to our records on the site. We have a list of our published guides that are available online, and a link to the advanced search options that are available through the catalog.

This is what the advanced search options look like through the Online Public Access system. You can do a keyword search; you can limit the search to the Center for Legislative Archives; limit the search for record groups such as House, Senate, Joint Committee, et cetera; and limit the record creator. When I talk about limiting the record creator that is limiting the committee names essentially.

On the screen is our new proposed research portal. As you can see, we have two different functionalities. We have created 24 new pages for the research portal, which is a vast improvement to the content that we currently have available for our researchers on our Web site. What we have done is combined feedback that we heard from the Advisory Committee, and from our researchers, into these two search options to find our records. We now will have "Search Our Records" and "Browse Our Records" as search options. We also have three other new sections on our Web site: "Getting Started with Your Research," "Congressional Web Harvest," and "News and Events." I will walk through those pages in a few minutes.

The "Search Our Records" section enables a guided search for congressional researchers. Here you are able to conduct a keyword search and, if you choose, limit the search to a specific committee and/or record group. This is where Michael was so helpful to us. He created this wonderful search box for us that provides a dynamic list of all of our committee organizations.

I have typed in an example. I am doing a keyword search for "March on Washington" and then also typed in "HUAC." What is really neat and lovely about the thing that Michael has developed for us is, as you type in a committee name, it will auto-populate with suggestions for the researcher. In this instance, I have typed in "HUAC," the House Un-American Activities Committee, and it is showing me the "House Committee on Internal Security" because I don't know the real name for HUAC, I just know it as "HUAC" or "House Un-American Activities Committee." This search box is dynamic and can tell me that this is the real committee name,

or the predecessor committee name. This will enable our researchers to have a greater understanding of the committees, and their history.

"Browse Our Records." We have decided to have this other section here for looking through our records. If you don't have a specific keyword or committee that you are interested in looking for, we created these pages here for committees and organizations with records that are at the Center. We have 154 House committees, 118 Senate committees, 32 joint committees, 10 legislative commissions, 10 legislative organizations, and 3 special collections all listed on these browse pages.

Because we have so many House and Senate committees, we decided to break down those lists even further into four other subpages. They are organized into standing committees, select committees, special committees, and administrative and support offices. We have 89 standing committees for the House, and 71 standing committees for the Senate. We are still working with a long list of committees, but it is growing smaller because we have been able to break them into these subpages.

On each of these browse pages, we have an alphabetical listing of all the committees and organizations with hyperlinks to the corresponding description and digital content available in OPA. And, of course, because of the long list of committees, we have some search tips also on this page to help navigate these long lists. Once you click on the hyperlink of each committee, it will pull up the Online Public Access, and you will be able to see the description that is associated with that committee.

The "Getting Started with Your Research" section is a new section for our site which includes seven pages. We are working on an eighth page currently under development on research tutorials, where we will have some videos and step-by-step instructions on conducting congressional research. In "Getting Started with Your Research," we wanted a way that we could clearly state what records we have, and what records we don't have in congressional records. All of the sections of "Getting Started With Your Research" were developed from a frequently-asked-questions document that our reference archivists use, so it is questions that



we get via email or as walk-in researchers coming in to do research. Questions such as: Do you have Members' private papers? We don't, but we wanted to be able to provide a clear statement for researchers to be able to understand where they may be able to find those resources. So we have these very simple pages stating what we have and what we don't have. And if we don't have those records, we try to provide examples of where you can find that material.

Again, similarly, with "What's Online and What's Not Online," we wanted an easy, simple way for our researchers to know what we have available online and what we don't have available online. And if records are not available online, we inform researchers how to access information if you would like to come to the National Archives to do research in person.

The "Research Guides and Tools" section includes a listing of the majority of our resources that are available at the Center for Legislative Archives for our researchers. It includes links to our published guides that are available online, information about our finding aids and preliminary inventories, information about the Online Public Access system, and instructions for citing the records of Congress. Here we have provided an all-important section about rules of access. We wanted to make sure that we had a place that explained the rules of access, how to plan your trip to the Archives, pull times, research room hours, and all information that our researchers would need to know to come do research at the National Archives, especially related to the Center for Legislative Archives' records.

The new section "Getting Started with Your Research" highlights other resources available to our researchers that are not part of the National Archives, but are helpful in doing congressional research. We have links in this section for pages maintained by the House and Senate, links to the Library of Congress, resources for Members' papers, including congressional research centers such as the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress, a link to the congressional repository index that the Center maintains, and a few additional sites our researchers may find useful like the CyberCemetery, which captures the web presence of defunct legislative branch commissions.

Speaking of Web harvest, we have this new section on our Web site, which we didn't have links to before, about the congressional Web harvest that we conduct. It explains how and why we conduct the Web harvest and provides links to sections of the Web harvest for previous Congresses.

And, finally, the last new section that we are speaking briefly about today is the "News and Events" section that was created primarily to announce significant and new descriptions that are available in the catalog. It is also a place to announce events and exhibits we have such as our "Researcher Talk" series featuring prominent researchers who have used House and Senate records to write dissertations, books, etc. There will be events that are important for our researchers to know about so we will continue to update this page regularly for our researchers who are interested in coming to some of our talks and also learning about new descriptions that are available online.

We will continue to make improvements after the site goes live and, of course, incorporate any comments that you all have related to our Web site. And, we will continue to make changes and harness new technologies that occur in the archives.gov site improvements. Kelly and I would be happy to answer any questions that you have related to our presentation.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. Sharon?

Ms. Leon. Let me begin. I want to thank Natalie and Kelly and the rest of the staff at the Center for Legislative Archives, and David for making, in 6 months, what looks like a gigantic leap forward in "Making Access Happen" -- strategic goal number one.

Mr. Ferriero. Thank you very much.

Ms. Leon. This is spectacular.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

Ms. Koed. I couldn't quite tell from your slides, but when you go into this process with your

initial search on say HUAC, do you then have additional filtering so you could narrow down by Congress, or by date? What sort of filtering system do you have for your search results?

Ms. Rocchio. Filtering by Congress is a feature that will be rolling out in the next version of OPA. So that is not available right now, but it has been approved and will be implemented in the coming months into the Online Public Access system.

Ms. Koed. Great.

Ms. Rocchio. So let's just go back to the OPA search.

Mr. Hunt. And tell them the order of the presentation of the search results.

Ms. Rocchio. The look and feel of OPA, as the next development rolls out, will be changing. Right now, when you search in the catalog, you are provided with the top three results for digital access, and also description-only records. That will be changing with the new version of OPA. So it won't look like this. It will look very different. Jacqie can speak more to what the catalog will look like moving forward because she deals primarily with that. We really wanted to provide -- and that is something that we have heard from our researchers and we have heard from all of you -- an overlay into the catalog that was focused on congressional records and enabled our congressional researchers to be able to get into the catalog, make sense of what is there, and sort through it that way. If you are very savvy with your searches, you can go in and refine your search even further if you choose to do that, or you can just browse through what is pulled up automatically.

Ms. Koed. Do the final results include the record group information? So, say I am looking at records from the 1840s, and there is nothing digital, and I am planning a trip to the Archives to do research, does it give you that kind of detail that I can compile ahead of time and take with me on my visit?

Ms. Rocchio. Yes. When you go into the description for the records, you will be able to see

the timeframe of the records and the dates that the records span. You will also be able to see some additional descriptive information that we have provided that our reference archivists worked on. There is a large description project that our office is undertaking and you will be able to access all that information from the catalog.

Mr. Hunt. And remember, we have added the preliminary inventory information into OPA. So you not only get series descriptions, we are now down to folder- level and close to item-level description for older records.

Ms. Koed. That is great.

Mr. Hunt. It has really come a long way.

Ms. Vogt. I just wanted to add my compliments to Natalie and Kelly and everyone else who was involved on this project. When they called me and asked me to preview it with them, I was very impressed. They have done so much in such a short length of time. It is wonderful.

Mr. Zink. I agree. I noticed the congressional Web harvest is mentioned on the site, -- and Richard can probably answer this -- is there a private contractual arrangement to win a bid for harvesting?

Mr. Hunt. Internet Archive, who has been doing our harvesting, won the initial bid from the National Archives to do it for 1 year, with 3 option years. So our option years are up, and it is going to go back out for bid.

Mr. Zink. Oh, okay. Okay.

Mr. Hunt. They probably have a good shot at it.

Mr. Zink. Yeah. I was just wondering if people were lining up at your door to do that.

Mr. Hunt. No, but we are seeing a lot more interest in the Web harvest content, I will tell you that much.

Mr. Zink. Oh, I am sure.

Mr. Hunt. It is a very valuable collection.

Ms. Rocchio. I know Karen and Robin were very happy to see the direct links on the new research portal.

Mr. Hunt. Well, we have to return to Robin's comments and the work of your staff and Karen's comments, that for records that are coming over now, metadata descriptions are coming with the records. So, when the records are open in the future, the metadata will be plugged into description records

Mr. Zink. It will be so much easier then.

Mr. Hunt. So much easier.

Ms. Paul. You are going to be able to discover the records, but they are not going to be housed anywhere within reach.

Mr. Hunt. We are trying to keep it on a high tone to the end.

Ms. Haas. Well, Natalie and Kelly, thank you very much. As has been said around the table, I would just like to echo, it is wonderful to see all the improvements that have been made since the last meeting and to see the progress. So thank you all and all the folks at the Archives.

Mr. Hunt. The News and Events section is referred to at the Center as the "Don Ritchie page." We have been hammering, "researchers need to know when new records are open," in his honor.

Ms. Haas. Excellent. Thank you.

Next on the agenda is the report by the Center for Legislative Archives. Richard Hunt, the director of the Center, will provide us with an update.

Mr. Hunt. Well, you all have our well-designed and informative midyear report, where we try to cover the major functions that we perform for the House and Senate and researchers and the wider public and educational community. And I am happy to answer any questions that you may have about the report.

I am always struck, with a staff of 20, how much high-quality work is done on so many fronts. I will point out three or four major highlights and issues that I think the committee would be concerned with and want to hear an update.

One is, you will notice we have a dual challenge on the electronic records front. On the one hand, we are doing this nostalgic retrospective visit of media from 3.5-inch floppies and 5.25-inch, where Brandon has been shopping on eBay so we can get players to actually open these files. And you have to realize, there are thousands of these, and we are finding more every day as we open boxes transferred 10 to 15 years ago. And the amount of time it takes Brandon and Shannon to load, open, capture, process -- it is hours of work for a small digital volume of content. But they are official committee records, so they are the most valuable records we have. So these two are slogging away on this particular effort.

And then on the other end we have the records of the FCIC and some of the other more recent legislative branch commissions that have records for the moment imprisoned in the SharePoint instance. Or we have other sort of exotic and esoteric formats and media types and encrypted systems, and they have to break those down, as well. So they are working on sort of the low end of the technological frontier and the very high end at the same time.

We are just so fortunate to have two such talented people that are leading us through that, as

well as the continued support of Bob Spangler, an old friend of this committee, who continues to provide technological advice to us. So we are working that frontier very hard.

I would also just like to remind the committee that we will be doing a Web harvest at the end of this year. So, in the fall, we will be reaching out to you as we begin our preparations to make sure that we get the most complete and accurate harvest of all congressional Web sites. It is a major endeavor. Both the contracting and the administration of that, which had previously been handled in another office in the National Archives, has been transferred to our plate, so it is another responsibility for Brandon.

We have cleared some hurdles on the relocation of the congressional records instance from Archives II to Archives I. The CIA came down for a site visit and also inspected all of our facilities, plans, and renovations, and we have the green light to proceed with the preparation of SCIFs for the classified and unclassified CRI. Plans have been drawn up, and a statement of work is soon to be released so that someone can make a bid and begin work. There is a slight snag on air-conditioning issues that Facilities and the engineer and architect are arguing about, but that will be resolved soon, Brandon? Yes. So we are saying by the end of the fiscal year, which is October 1, we will have the space ready and the unclassified set up and operational. Classified? No.

Mr. Hirsch. Pending certification by the certified agents.

Mr. Hunt. Yes. So, progress on that front. And then I hope you notice in the one pie chart, when you look at our outreach activities, that the digital and social media piece has gotten incrementally bigger. And that is really due to the leadership of Natalie Rocchio, who you just heard from.

And one measure of her success and what a big deal she has become is she was one of two National Archives staff to be invited to the White House Tumblr Q&A last week on college affordability. So she was over there just tweeting away on our behalf. We are very proud of all that she has done.

She is also one of the architects, along with Christine Blackerby, of our Congress225 project, where we are celebrating the 225th anniversary of the first Congress, using Tumblr and Web postings and education blogs and all sorts of things. And it is surprising, the rich materials left from that ancient Congress from so long ago that speak so much to the present.

Mr. Ferriero. And I understand the President dropped in on the Tumblr event?

Ms. Rocchio. Yes, the President was there. Very exciting.

Ms. Haas. Excellent.

Mr. Hunt. So that concludes my formal remarks, but I am happy to entertain any questions.

Ms. Erickson. I just have a question, for Brandon -- do you have an estimate on when you will have the capability to accept electronic files, and by that I mean a day when the House and Senate can just electronically send records to you all?

Mr. Hunt. By pushing a button --

Ms. Erickson. Yes, by pushing a button.

Mr. Hunt. -- over a big cable?

Ms. Erickson. Yes.

Mr. Hunt. Brandon, when will that day be?

Mr. Hirsch. It is something that we would love to see, as well. We have had many conversations within the agency about that. I think it is an ongoing conversation.



Mr. Hunt. We have had those discussions with our friends at Rocket Center. Is that true?

Mr. Hirsch. Yes.

Mr. Hunt. And what was their reaction?

Mr. Hirsch. I think it is something everybody would like on our side, but the hurdles are fairly significant. It is an ongoing process, we will have more conversations even within the agency as we continue.

Mr. Hunt. It is certainly desirable by all parties.

Ms. Paul. Are any agencies transferring records that way at this point?

Mr. Hirsch. I believe so, yes, on the Federal side. I couldn't tell you a number, but there are agencies that transfer some records electronically.

Mr. Ferriero. Jay, do you want to say something about where we are?

Mr. Bosanko. I was frantically trying to think of what the right number is. This is something that is of strong interest not only of ours but to all the other departments and agencies -- or, not all, because some of them would rather not, from a security perspective. But, you know, essentially, we have to be able to ingest large volumes of electronic records from across the executive branch. And we are trying to develop our next iteration of technology to be able to bring it in, to store it, service it, and provide reference service. So maybe that is something we can talk about at the next meeting.

Ms. Koed. It really does dovetail with long-term space issues.

Mr. Ferriero. Absolutely.

Ms. Haas. Any other comments?

Mr. Thomas. Yes.

Ms. Haas. Jeff?

Mr. Thomas. I have been really impressed in the last 10 years or so about the efforts, and the successful efforts, that have been made to transfer electronic records from committees and commissions over to Richard's organization and preserving those records. The work has been very commendable, where we were 10 years ago.

But we are reaching the point now where we need to look at the other side of that coin, and that would be access. As these records become available, how are researchers going to look at this material? Will it be online through the catalog? Will it be at a dedicated server space or screen within the reading room?

One of the things that was in Richard's report here when he was talking about open electronic records was that -- he was saying that when it is available through the OPA, they are described on the item level. I am not sure that is sustainable in the future when you start dealing with -- I mean, you look at the bell curve as you go along and these records become available. We are talking about thousands, tens of thousands, of records all at once becoming available.

And that is sort of the problem that we are having throughout the archival profession; it is just not limited to Richard's shop. How are these going to be made available without doing an item-level description? I am not here to offer a solution, by any means, but I think that that is the next area that resources need to be invested in. This is going to take some staff time and resources to figure out how this is going to be accomplished.

Mr. Hunt. I am just not quite certain if that is a restriction and a requirement or just an example of what we have done, whether some collection-level electronic records could be made available, as well. Brandon or Jacqie?

Mr. Hirsch. I would defer to Jacqie on this.

Ms. Haas. Jacqie, do you want to come up to the table?

Ms. Ferry. Sure. I don't know if I have that much to add, but --

Ms. Haas. And, Jeff, I know you have raised this issue before, and it is obviously an important one for us to continue to work on.

Ms. Ferry. So you are right; at this point, Online Public Access is our primary public access point for all records. There is capability within OPA to describe records at all levels. Right now, all digital, born digital objects and digitized material are described at the item level, but I think within the data model there could be opportunities to change that. That is not something the Center would do alone. That would be something that would need to be done across OPA.

I do know that -- and this is from Pam Wright. A couple weeks ago, Pam instituted a next-generation finding working group, which is a NARA-wide group. So this might be something that would fit into that group's work, but that group is just now being established. And I will be a member of that group, so I can definitely take this to that group as a concern.

Ms. Haas. That would be great.

Mr. Ferriero. I was going to say, this isn't just a problem for your records, it is a problem for all of our records -- the same massive amount of electronic content that we need to provide access to.

Ms. Leon. Since people seem to be here for decades, I want to make a suggestion that there is a way to -- that there may be an emerging way to solve some of these problems that is coming out of digital humanities topic modeling technology. And that is a process by which we can algorithmically read huge quantities of text and raise out of that text larger, sort of, subject

headings, simply on a computational front. And then, once those topics emerge, then we can drill back down to the records that they link to.

And so it is possible that if we start to bring these kinds of things together, we may get some assist from the algorithmic front to go along with the human technology necessary to describe these records. So, we will see where we are in 10 years. Maybe I am wrong.

Mr. Hunt. And there is a lot of data associated with electronic records at very specific levels. So I could see, if you crunch your way through it --

Ms. Leon. You can see what area you want to run the data mining on, and so it is -- automatic creation of finding it may be a possibility.

Ms. Haas. Jeff, why don't we keep this issue on our agenda, and we can ask Jacqie for some follow-up, potentially, see if there is any progress at the new working group at our next meeting? Okay.

Mr. Ferriero. Jeff, do you want to contribute to our conversation about the Civil Rights Act?

Mr. Thomas. Just that I seem to be one of hundreds of people across the country who will be celebrating that act this year. It is well-deserving.

Ohio State will be having an exhibit opening this fall. I have the honor of taking care of the papers of Bill McCulloch, who represented the 4th District of Ohio during that time period. So the exhibit will be pulling material from both his collection and other special collections at Ohio State. And, tentatively, we have John Lewis coming to be there at the opening of the exhibit. So if you are in Columbus any time between September and January, we would be welcome to show it to you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. Any other new business for the group?

Ms. Erickson. Karen, I am wondering if we should have a motion to formally establish the working group regarding the space issue?

Ms. Haas. I think that is a good idea. Is there a motion?

Ms. Koed. So moved.

Ms. Haas. Okay. Second?

Mr. Thomas. Second.

Ms. Haas. Okay. All those in favor? All right. Let's move forward with the working group. And I know Nancy and I pledge to have our staffs fully engaged in that effort. And we look forward to working with your staff, David, to see what we need to make progress in that area. Thank you.

Richard, I didn't have a chance to thank you for your report. Nancy, at the beginning in her remarks, thanked her staff for all the continued work they do, and I just want to join Nancy in that. And also appreciate the assistance in helping to put this meeting together, so thank you all very much.

Mr. Hunt. Our pleasure.

Ms. Haas. Any other comments before we close this meeting of the Advisory Committee? All right. Thank you all for your attendance. The meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:43 a.m., the meeting was concluded.]