

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS  
MEETING 48  
JUNE 22, 2015  
MEETING ROOM SVC 203-02  
CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER

The meeting began at 10:02 a.m., Hon. Julie Adams [Secretary of the Senate] presiding.

Members of the Committee in attendance: Julie Adams, Chair (Secretary of the Senate); Karen Haas, Co-Chair (Clerk of the House); David Ferriero (Archivist of the United States); Betty Koed (Historian, U.S. Senate); Matthew Wasniewski (Historian, U.S. House of Representatives); John Lawrence (Visiting Professor, University California, Washington DC campus); Sharon Leon (Director of Public Projects, Center for History and New Media, George Mason University); Deborah Skaggs Speth (Archivist, McConnell – Chao Archives, University of Louisville, McConnell Center); (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, U.S. Senate; Robin Reeder, Archivist, U.S. House of Representatives; Richard Hunt, Director, Center for Legislative Archives, National Archives and Records Administration; and Charlie Flanagan, Supervisor for Outreach and Educational Programs, Center for Legislative Archives, National Archives and Records Administration.

ADAMS: Good morning. This meeting of the Advisory Committee on the records of Congress will now come to order. I welcome back those committee members who have been previously serving, including John Lawrence, Sharon Leon, Jeff Thomas, Sheryl Vogt, and Steven Zink. We will continue to rely on your good advice and counsel. I offer an especially warm welcome to our new members, Deborah Skaggs Speth, archivist for the Senator Mitch McConnell and Secretary Elaine Chao Archives at the University of Louisville, and Dr. Betty Koed, Historian of the U.S. Senate. The Senate said goodbye to Don Ritchie last month, and we wish him well in retirement. He is now officially Historian Emeritus of the U.S. Senate. At this time, would members please introduce themselves to Deborah and Betty, and then Deborah and Betty, if you can then introduce yourselves to us? So I will turn to you, David.

FERRIERO: David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States.

WASNIEWSKI: Matt Wasniewski, Historian of the House.

REEDER: Robin Reeder, Archivist, U.S. House of Representatives.

THOMAS: Jeff Thomas. I'm the archivist of the Ohio Congressional Archives at the Ohio State University.

LAWRENCE: I'm John Lawrence. I teach at the University of California campus here in Washington. I worked on the Hill for 38 years before that.

LEON: I'm Sharon Leon. I'm the Director of Public Projects at the Roy Rosenzweig Center for Historical and New Media, which is a wholly-owned subsidiary of the Department of History and Art History of George Mason University.

HUNT: Richard Hunt, the Director of the Center for Legislative Archives.

ZINK: Steve Zink, Vice Chancellor for Information Technology at Nevada System of Higher Education.

VOGT: I'm Sheryl Vogt, Director of the Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies at the University of Georgia, and I'd like to mention, that I put some information about us on the table. This is our 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary. I think the information shows the breadth of the kinds of papers that we're saving in congressional centers. So, at your leisure, I hope you'll have a look at this. We're very proud of the program we put together. Thank you.

PAUL: I'm Karen Paul, the Senate Archivist in the Senate Historical Office.

KOED: I'm Betty Koed. I'm the Senate Historian. I've been with the Senate since 1998. I was the Associate Historian for many years, and became Senate Historian on June 1, after Don Ritchie's retirement.

HAAS: I'm Karen Haas, the Clerk of the House.

SKAGGS SPETH: And I'm Deborah Skaggs Speth. I am the archivist for U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell and Secretary Elaine Chao at the University of Louisville's McConnell Center.

ADAMS: I happily spent a number of years working for Senator McConnell, who was personally invested in his archives, and in turn, imparted to his staff the importance of legislative archiving. I have a true appreciation for the significant work that all of you do. Upon reading Secretary of the Senate Nancy Erickson's comments at the December Advisory Committee meeting, it became quite clear that this committee has helped us achieve great things, and I am pleased to be serving as Chair for this Congress.

These great accomplishments include passage of H.Con.Res.307 in 2008, which urged Members to preserve the records of their service and deposit them in a research institution of their choosing, establishing the Congressional Records Instance of the Electronic Records Archive in 2009, which propelled us into making great strides in preserving our electronic records, reorganizing the Center as a part of Legislative Archives, Presidential Libraries, and Museum Services in August of 2011, which placed Congressional collections on par with presidential libraries within the administrative structure, and after much research and planning, in 2013, implementing new work flows, data collection forms, and accessioning records into the Archivist Toolkit, which transformed access to Congressional records. All of this and more has been accomplished with the guidance and help of this committee. I would like to compliment the leadership of my co-chair, the Honorable Karen Haas, Clerk of the U.S. House, and the support of David Ferriero, Archivist of the United States. As we work together on a

solution to the record storage space issues, I look forward to the presentation we will hear today.

In April, I signed a memorandum of understanding with the Center, outlining protocols for the temporary storage and retrieval of selected Senate records at the Washington National Records Center, and I also implemented a process for approving such transfers. Relocation of the first 1,000 cubic feet was approved in April. As a temporary solution is underway, I look forward to working on the long-term solution for the records of Congress.

At this time, I would like to recognize the Clerk of the House, Karen Haas, and thank her for her guidance to me personally. We have developed a strong partnership through many of the different facets of our jobs, and I think our staffs work very well together on the important work we are charged with. Karen?

HAAS: Thank you so much. Let me begin by also joining Julie in welcoming all of you back, and for our new members, we're really happy to have you here. I also want to welcome Betty specifically, in your new position as Historian. The Historians' offices have traditionally worked very closely together, and we look forward to continuing that cooperation going forward.

Since we last met, we've been involved in the discussions and planning about space and storage at the National Archives. Later in this meeting, we will be briefed on the progress of those activities, and I will hold my comments regarding the space issue until we have that briefing. However, I'd like to provide an update on some of the activities that we have been involved in since our December meeting.

With the beginning of the new Congress, our office is always incredibly busy. Ten committees have new leadership, and these changes affect committee staffing, including the addition of new hires responsible for managing records, who require training on records management. We have been proactive in meeting with committees, and the

addition of the records management class, through the House Learning Center, has helped us as well. I'd like to compliment Robin and her team for their activities in training and guidance for both the new chairmen, the new committee staff, but also for their outreach to new Members. We had 60 freshmen Members come into the House this year, so they have been very aggressive in their outreach to those new freshmen Members in setting up their offices.

And in closing, Julie, I would just like to thank you for organizing this meeting. As you said earlier, our staffs have already started working very closely together. And Julie and I have spent a lot of quality time together this year. Thank you so much.

ADAMS: Thank you, Karen. At this time, I'd like to recognize David Ferriero for any comments he may have. David?

FERRIERO: Good morning. Welcome, Julie. So let me bring you up to date on what's been keeping me up at night since we last met, and it's all about records management. Missing email, use of alias accounts, and exclusive use of personal email accounts has all resulted in a new focus and appreciation for the importance of good records management across the executive branch as well as here on the Hill. This has resulted in the creation and revision of much of our guidance to the agencies, including such things as determining the appropriate age for scheduling and transfer of permanent records, managing digital identity authentication records, a draft bulletin on managing electronic messages, experimentation with analytical tools around records management maturity models, and so on. I urge you to keep up to date on these revisions in the *Records Express* blog on the National Archives site, where our Chief Records Officer reports daily.

I am most pleased to report that OPM has released the final position classification flysheet and qualification standard for the records and information management series. It's the first time in the Federal government that we have an occupational series with respect to records creation, disposition, maintenance, and use. So I'm dancing in the streets because of that.

Kudos to the House and Senate Archivists and staff for their work on the metadata front, which provided a model for all government records processing, as far as I'm concerned. Having those working closest to the records providing the descriptive information about textual and electronic records before transfer is invaluable. This information is crucial to effective retrieval. At the midyear point, we are already close to the number of accession, name, and subject records created in all of 2014, so thank you very much for all of the work that you have done.

A week ago today, I had the opportunity to participate in the 800<sup>th</sup> birthday party for Magna Carta at Runnymede, and to see the close ties between our Charters of Freedom and the very many versions of Magna Carta, so it was a special opportunity for me to represent the United States. And I sadly note the passing of two former Archivists since we last met. James Bert Rhoads, who was the fifth Archivist, died in April, and just last week, Allen Weinstein, the ninth Archivist of the United States, passed away.

ADAMS: Thank you, David. It is now time to review the minutes from the last meeting. Is there any objection to dispensing with the reading of the minutes? Hearing none. Are there any corrections to the minutes from the last meeting? OK. I would entertain a motion to approve.

GROUP: So move.

ADAMS: Second?

M1: Second.

F1: Yes.

ADAMS: All those in favor?

GROUP: Aye.

ADAMS: Opposed? OK, the meeting minutes are approved. And at this time I would like to recognize Senate Archivist Karen Paul. Karen?

PAUL: Thank you. By the end of the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, 18 senators' offices closed, 14 senators selected archival repositories, and four are holding their records in personal custody. Two of the four are planning to donate, and the two short-term placeholders are still engaged in making up their minds. I think what is really a good indication of Members' desire to preserve their records is illustrated by the decisions of Members who were defeated. Four of the five immediately chose to preserve their collections in a repository, and the fifth is in the process of getting the collection ready to donate.

Our office has had a lot of questions about access, legal instruments, the process of donating, and most of all, security of electronic records once they are sent to a repository. To help our Members better understand the issues, we provided questions for them to ask the repositories about their electronic records programs. We are working with the five offices that we know will be closing at the end of this Congress, and revised our handbook, *Preserving Senate History: Closing a Senator's Office* into its third edition. We are always looking for photos, by the way, of Congressional repositories, or exhibits, and training that you do, so please keep us in mind when you hold a special event and share a copy of your photos for illustration purposes.

Our newly elected Members received information as part of their orientation in December, including a brief pamphlet, and a quick card entitled *Five Things Every Staff Director Should Know about Records Preservation*. These were delivered by Don Ritchie to Members at his orientation week welcome. More in depth information was conveyed in *Opening an Office: 114<sup>th</sup> Congress Handbook*, a joint publication with the Senate Sergeant-at-Arms, which also was available on the transition site. As new offices begin to settle in, I'm meeting individually with key staff to present them with the *Senator's Office Archives Tool Kit*.

A video seminar on records management for state offices debuted in March and had staff from 35 state offices attend. I extend my thanks to Alan Haeberle, Colleen Mason, and Marie Carr, archivists for Senators Hatch, Leahy, and Nelson respectively, for sharing their insights about best practices for state office records. Future guidance for Members includes a soon-to-be-released revision and updating of the Members' Records Disposition Schedule. If any committee members would like to see this before it is finalized, we would appreciate your comments. This schedule will provide a lot of detail, and is updated, most importantly, for electronic records information. It is designed to be a complementary handbook for *Archives Toolkit*.

For committee records, we provided a steady stream of guidance to committee staff leading up to the fall elections, and continuing through the end of the Congress, working especially closely with chief clerks and systems administrators. We encouraged proactive archiving of electronic records by running and preserving full backups pre-election. We now encourage this when committee and subcommittee chairs change as well. As a result of the election, we had a 60% change in committee majority and ranking staff directors in the new year. And I have to comment that this was unprecedented. Fortunately for records management continuity, there was only minimal change in chief clerks and systems administrators, and most fortunate of all, we kept all of our committee archivists in place.

Records transfers have been heavy, as was expected with the change in the Senate majority. From a year ago to the present, we've transferred 764 accessions, totaling 2,054 cubic feet, from 26 Senate committees and offices, and 2.6 terabytes of electronic records from 13 different committees. We currently are compiling a *Senate Committee Archives Tool Kit*, and a companion records schedule.

We have worked with the Senate legal counsel to update counsel guidance on ownership of committee records that incorporates elements from H.R. 1233 and the Presidential and Federal Records Act amendments of 2014. While this act applies to the executive



branch, it serves as a measure for the legislative branch, particularly for our efforts to preserve committee digital assets. While we have been providing guidance on the preservation of records on mobile devices, we're pleased to receive the new NARA guidance on preserving text messages, which we are incorporating into our guidance. Thank you very much for that.

The biggest challenge during the past six months has been keeping up with the changes in committee staffing and the heavy accessioning of records. We recognize that committees with staff archivists were much better positioned to preserve their records, and we know that the historical records of these committees are exemplary.

Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler continues to work with six committees without archivists on capturing, describing, and transferring their collections, including staff accounts, emails, and shared drives. She heads up efforts to complete the transfer of backlogs of these committees. We've been helped by summer and other interns in completing this work. Despite not having an archivist on staff, these committees have produced a good number of staff files and emails, a situation made possible by interested and conscientious chief clerks and IT administrators, assisted by our office. We also acquired the electronic records of the last Secretary of the Senate and her staff, and the electronic records from the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress Federal Election Committee filings, with the Senate Public Records office. This was a first for the Senate.

Training has become essential to us for keeping up with electronic records management. Deputy Archivist Alison White is our digital curation specialist and earned her Digital Archives Specialist certificate by passing the comprehensive exam in February 2015. Beginning in March of 2014, she took a total of 12 DAS (Digital Archive Specialist) classes, starting with Standards for Digital Archives, and concluding with Digital Forensics for Archivists and Information Architecture. So Alison, congratulations.

Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler is very active in the northern Virginia chapter of the American Records Management Association, and she attends monthly seminars. In May

of 2015, she took a seminar on records retention schedules, and passed the exam, and received ARMA's Retention Program Development certificate. We attend specialized training as it becomes available in the Washington, D.C. community, most recently attending an excellent email preservation symposium sponsored jointly by the Library of Congress and the National Archives. And I thank the National Archives for arranging such an excellent symposium.

Two weeks ago we spent an intensive two days in a digital curation camp designed for the National Digital Stewardship fellows and hosts. A particular highlight, for those of you who keep track of these things, was Daniel Russell's "Google's Uber Tech Lead for Search Quality and User Happiness," Dr. Russell's Ph.D. is in computer science, but he realized that amplifying human intelligence is his real passion. And I have to say, I think he amplified ours that day.

At our December meeting, I announced that we had just learned we were a finalist for the NDSR fellowship. We were selected, and our fellow joined our staff last week. Please meet our fellow, Mr. John Caldwell, who joined our office just last week. Mentored by Alison White and Elisabeth Butler, John will be documenting our digital records accessioning process, beginning with committee offices as the records transfer through our office to the final ingest into the Congressional Records Instance of the Electronic Record Archive. He will also investigate preservation procedures in Members' offices. He will be testing specific software to identify products that can improve curation practices while records are still in the Senate, focusing on file stability before collections are moved and processed. And as you know for a Member's office, this can take place over many, many years, and we're concerned about data stability over all of that time. A white paper will be produced outlining his findings, and making suggestions for implementing specific practices moving forward. Our goal is to align what we are doing with what the Center is doing in the most effective manner.

We in the Senate's community and a Member's archivist will be working with John to document a variety of workflows currently in place to identify best practices, and

possible tools that can automate them, and then work to incorporate those practices and tools. So we look forward to sharing this work with the committee at appropriate points along the way.

And I wanted to give you an update about our technology advisory group projects. At the end of 2013, we joined the Sergeant-at-Arms Technology Advisory Group, otherwise known as TAG, and proposed a business need for Senate offices to assess, identify, and contract with vendors to archive our social media. By November, we had licenses with three vendors. So between November and the end of the Congress, we worked closely with committees and also focused on the offices of departing members. Of the 13 committees using social media, 12 preserved their records. We lost one because the account disappeared before we could get it. Three hired a vendor, and nine self-archived, primarily their Twitter accounts. Deputy Archivist Alison White is currently evaluating the committee accessions and reports that a preliminary review shows that the amount and type of metadata, as well as the ability to view archived records in their native format, is improved by use of a vendor. The one platform that supports a fairly robust internal download at this time is Twitter. However, that could change with little or no advanced notice, and the self-download captures all tweets posted, but not necessarily conversations.

This might be less problematic for committees who tend to use social media to push information out, but could be an issue for Members' offices who interact with constituents and the public on social media. Our first round of demos was held in November, and the second round is, in fact, beginning this afternoon. So if anyone would like to come to a demo at 1:30, if you're just curious as to what these vendors can do, please let us know and we'll invite you.

We're beginning to be more and more active with TAG. Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler has joined an assessment team to look at a task management solution for the Senate personal offices, and Heather Moore, the Senate Photo Historian, has joined a working group to investigate a photo management tool that might integrate with the

Senate photo studio platform, and include well-designed metadata, and tagging, and so forth.

I wanted to report on where we are with conversations about constituent services system (CSS) data downloads. I know that this is something that this committee has raised, repeatedly. And I want you to know where we are in those discussions. We have been advised that the Senate CSS data collections are too large for the Microsoft Access option offered to House Members and described by Bob Reeves at our December meeting as being “a popular choice” with retiring House Members. We also are advised that repositories are beginning to ask for more data in the CSS downloads as they acquire staff with the skill sets to deal with this type of data.

So following up on presentations of last August by the Congressional Papers Roundtable, we began discussions with folks who worked on the Senator Byrd Archive at Shepherd University, the Gore Archive at Middle Tennessee State, and Members who retired who were especially interested in preserving this data. We began discussions with the Sergeant-at-Arms concerning future downloads. And we began by discussing the feasibility of a full export of all data tables. The cost and volume of records were considerations raised. The Senate Data Interchange format, available if offices move from one system to another, was suggested as an alternative, because it is common to all four systems in use in the Senate, and it contains 230 tables, versus the 32 currently offered in the Data Archiving Format. One Member who just retired elected to archive his entire database, as well as the Senate Exchange Format, so we are hoping to use this particularly robust download to explore the possibility of building an open source database that would be available to congressional repositories. This could be a grant-funded project, and is something about which people have expressed interest. So we are hoping that more Members will elect to receive the expanded data export, and that our congressional centers will pursue the challenge of building a specific vehicle to receive and reactivate constituent data, protecting, of course, any private information. Another reassurance on that point is that we know that researchers wish to be able to use the data in the aggregate and are hoping that this plan, if successful, would help that happen.

I want to thank Christine Blackerby and Charles Flanagan of the Center for Legislative Archives for helping us to celebrate Congress Week, the first week of April, by sharing some of Congress' historical treasures through their presentation, "Congress and the Bill of Rights Aptly Revealed." This event was broadcast by CSPAN and is available in their archive. Thanks.

FLANAGAN: Thank you.

PAUL: And I wanted to thank my colleague, Robin Reeder, for her excellent leadership of the Program Committee for the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress meeting. It was truly an excellent, excellent meeting, and thank you so much. I know how much work you put into that. And I'd like to recognize and thank three of our Senate archivists for jumping in to fill a last-minute cancellation on a panel focusing on electronic records. Their theme was "Three Archivists Face Three Challenges." Katie Delacenserie, Archivist of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, discussed challenges of archiving and preserving shared drives and SharePoint. Matt Stahl, the Archivist of the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, discussed challenges of preserving email, and Alison White, Senate Deputy Archivist, tackled social media archiving. And yes, we have more than three challenges, but that was all the time we were allotted. So thank you.

ADAMS: Thank you, Karen. I appreciate all that you and your team are doing, and have done. It's remarkable. I know with a new Congress, there's a lot on your plate, so thank you for all that you've done. At this time, I would like to recognize Robin Reeder for an update on House Archives. Robin?

REEDER: Thank you, Julie. I have some new statistics since the last Advisory Committee meeting. We've had 18 consultations with Members, 7 with committees. We've had photos cataloged since the last meeting, including oversize photos, for a total of 594. Textual records transferred through us were 900,069 pages. Electronic records

transferred through us totaled 928 gigabytes, and we called back 116,250 pages in loans. We processed and transferred 241 boxes to the National Archives of committee records returned to us from the John Moss papers at California State University. These records contain important documentation on the development of the Freedom of Information Act. They have passed the 30-year closure period, and once screened by the Center for Legislative Archives will serve as a significant research resource.

Heather Bourk wrote an article about alienated records for the upcoming *Congressional Papers Roundtable Newsletter*, which you all have a copy of. This is part of an effort to try and increase outreach to current Members about their committee records, in addition to working with repositories. Heather also is researching and drafting a proposal for new equipment to improve processing of House electronic records.

Alison Trulock coordinated and finalized our strategic plan for the Archives Division, which covers our goals as an office for the next 10 years. To help keep us on track with the strategic plan, Alison also has introduced us to a web-based project management software program, which other departments in the Clerk's office are also using. We are in the process of re-working the Records Management class for committees through the House Learning Center, with a focus on updating the content and increasing outreach.

In an effort to improve our web presence, we recently reorganized the "Records and Research" page on the [history.house.gov](http://history.house.gov) website and added new feature content highlighting House records. We continue to research and draft new web content, so stay tuned for more improvements.

Michelle Strizever of our staff presented to the cataloguing section of the Art Libraries Society of North America, or ARLIS conference in March. She gave a talk about cataloguing photos and visual materials, and she used examples from the House collection. Michelle and Heather also worked with the curatorial staff in the Office of Art and Archives to develop and implement a location scheme for photos, both print and born digital, in our digital asset management system.

And the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress conference was held last month at the Center for Legislative Archives. I was very fortunate to chair the program with a wonderful committee, and we had a well-attended and informative conference. Sessions included one on women in Congress, featuring former members Connie Morella, Barbara Kennelly, and Eva Clayton, moderated by House Historian Matt Wasniewski. Other sessions covered electronic records, research and congressional holdings, and the final session, moderated by Senate Historian Emeritus Don Ritchie, was a discussion of oral histories and the voting rights act. Thank you very much.

ADAMS: Thank you, Robin. I know we are all eagerly awaiting the discussion on the GPO feasibility study, so I will turn it over to Richard Hunt, Director of the Center for Legislative Archives for a report. Richard?

HUNT: Thank you, Julie. For those that are new to the committee, I want to provide a little context, and that is the fact that the National Archives as an agency has a major space challenge that it's facing. David, and Jay Bosanko, the COO, are leading the efforts to determine long-term solutions to this agency-wide problem. We knew that by the end of calendar year 2014 that we would have a space shortage at the Center in the National Archives building, so we had to come up with a solution in order to continue accessioning House and Senate records. At the last meeting we talked about the Washington National Records Center. That's a facility in Suitland, Maryland, where we have about 25,000 cubic feet of space that's available to the Center, and that's why we have those agreements in place with both the Clerk and the Secretary so that we can move inactive or closed records there and create new space in the downtown building. But that's a seven-year solution, and we wanted to find something that would get us to 2030.

While we think that the volume of paper records--which has risen for decades--is now cresting, we have not yet seen a downturn. At some point we're hoping it will actually bend the curve and our normal accessioning rate of 3,600 cubic feet per year may come

down. So this led to discussions by the Archivist and the Public Printer about the available space at the Government Publishing Office on North Capital Street. The National Archives, after showing interest in that space, contracted with Leo A. Daly, an architectural engineering and design firm, to look at those spaces and to come up with detailed specifications and plans for the conversion of those spaces to meet NARA's archival storage standards, which are not those of a typical warehouse. It has to be an equivalent of a National Archives' facility at College Park or downtown.

I have an overqualified slide-changer here for me, Brandon Hirsch, who's our IT specialist. So how do you convert two large spaces at the Government Publishing Office into archival storage space? NARA contracted with Leo A. Daly to prepare this feasibility study, and the goal was to maximize the storage while minimizing the necessary improvements to provide the best value to the government. Leo Daly provided a lengthy, detailed report to NARA's Space Management and Planning Office, with scope-of-work descriptions and concept drawings for each space, including detailed specifications and drawings for the architectural, structural, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, security, and communications systems. They also provided cost estimates for that work as well.

The Space Management and Planning Office assessed the report, made some adjustments to the figures, and summarized it for the consideration and approval of NARA's executives. A communication plan was then formulated, ensuring that no procurement-sensitive information would be released, and the slide deck that I'll share with you today reflects the information that we can share at a public meeting.

The "Background" slide summarizes the situation, and then also nominates some record candidates for moving into GPO space. We estimate we grow at about 3,600 cubic feet of House and Senate records per year. That said, we need somewhere between 55,000 and 75,000 cubic feet to get to year 2030. That larger figure of 75,000 includes GAO records and GPO records as well, since they grow about 1,000 cubic feet per year. You



can see the Washington National Records Center gives us at least seven years of expansion while we get a more final plan in place.

The candidate record groups to move are 60,000 to 70,000 cubic feet of House and Senate records that are closed and not available for public access. We're keeping the most recent ones in the National Archives building since they're prime candidates to go back to committees to support the current business of Congress, but that gives us a large volume of records that can be moved at some point in time. Of course, when those records cross the 20-or 30-year threshold and become open, they need to come back home to where the research center is, so there will be records moving back to the downtown building as well. There's also open legislative branch agency records at the College Park building, and that's about 52,000 cubic feet at present.

And there's been a discussion, or at least the suggestion, that the Center could take over the Members' papers courtesy storage function, which is now provided at the Washington National Records Center, and move it into the GPO space, and bring some staff over to help serve those as well. And that's 56,000 cubic feet of records. That grand total is 178,000 cubic feet of records, so it's a pretty significant volume. We'll go on to the next slide.

This slide details the relationship with GPO, which would be leasing the space to NARA. There's one of the familiar red brick buildings as office-type space, and then the building across the street, which is a former train and paper warehouse with railroad tracks is a huge open space. As soon as we saw the spaces we thought they were perfect candidates for archiving. They already have weight-bearing floors that can handle the stacks that we would install as well as the weight of the paper. Leo A. Daly was engaged to provide the study, and that was completed in May of 2015. OK, next slide.

Here you see Building A and Building D. I've probably gone by Building D many times for 26 years, never noticed it before, it's so unobtrusive. All right, next slide.

The result of the feasibility study is that there is 24,000 square feet of space on the third floor in Building A which yields 65,000 cubic foot capacity, contrasted with Building D, which has an additional 5,000 square feet which yields 140,000 cubic feet, because the shelving in that area can go up to 14-feet high. In building D, you would be building a building within a building basically, which would then have all of the air handlers and the other equipment outside of the archival space. They're re-running some of the pipes down underneath the floor that were above, so we're making it as safe as possible for records storage. Building A also has some office space and a conference room, so we can have staff that will rotate through there. If we did take Members' papers, they are actively researched by staff, so we would have to provide some suitable space for that, and it is less amenable in Building D which has just a few cubicles and a processing area. In total, over 205,000 cubic feet of space would be yielded from those two buildings.

I can't get into the details of costs. They said I could say the total is in the ballpark of \$15 million to convert those two spaces, so it seemed like a pretty reasonable amount. And there's other considerations as well. One is that there's an active federal security force present in the building. GPO has its own police force. The Capitol Police provides support as well. Capitol Police actually have office space in Building A, so we feel pretty safe on that front. And the adequate flooring, again, is a big issue. Prior to GPO, we had looked at other warehouse space, and that was a deal-breaker for many of the existing spaces in the D.C. area. We just couldn't find the right weight-bearing floors.

GPO is within a mile of Capitol Hill, and only a couple of miles from the National Archives building, so we can service it with current staff and transportation. GPO has additional space, so that when my successor comes on board in a few years, he or she might want to approach GPO about adding some additional archival space there. One of our concerns is GPO is actively looking for other tenants, including government tenants. And depending on the time it takes us to get the appropriations and let a contract, we hope that space will remain available. And then we don't know much about the GPO record on procurement and execution of construction projects, so that's an unknown to us, and we'd have to consult with GPO. But if all the news breaks favorably, we would

have a record storage space to get us to 2030, probably a little beyond. We think a solution is in sight.

The project steps assume an ask for appropriations in the FY 2017 cycle. Final design in 2017. Construction over 12 to 18 months for each building. I'm assuming that would be concurrently done. A subsequent funding request by the National Archives to operate and manage the space. And then moving in in FY 2019. So that's four years out. I'm sure you'll have some questions. Steve?

ZINK: I don't remember the other building either, but isn't there an underground passage?

HUNT: Yes, there is a tunnel between. It's from the second building, but we can get access to that. And there's elevators at various locations, and they're big, industrial size elevators, so it's really ideal space. Matt?

WASNIEWSKI: I have a space question, and it's kind of based on the math that you did for us. A hundred and seventy-eight thousand cubic feet, almost right away, are filled with items coming in, which leaves you 27,000 for new accessions.

HUNT: Twenty-seven thousand plus fifty to sixty thousand cubic feet available space at Archives I. So that there's space that you wouldn't see by looking at those numbers, but by moving things out of Archives I it gives us that additional space.

WASNIEWSKI: OK.

HUNT: So it's a little more.

WASNIEWSKI: OK.

HUNT: The total is closer to 70,000 or 80,000. Nature abhors a vacuum --you know, when you empty something, somebody wants to move something in. So, we'll just have to manage

the space. And again, there's going to be a lot of movement of records in and out of the downtown Archives building.

WASNIEWSKI: And that 7,200 cubic feet per Congress -- House and Senate records combined -- you don't see that has plateaued? Is there room for growth in paper records if you get the tidal wave before we go?

HUNT: It's averaged 3,600 per year for the last 20 to 30 years. And you know how it is -- one year's high and one year's low. And then other events can change the volume. Is it possible that there's more records out there that you good folks can stir up? I suppose. It's been very, very consistent on the House and Senate side. The explosion's coming on the digital side I suspect.

FERRIERO: But it would be very important to identify, if you're aware of stashes of records that are sitting out there, that you know are eventually coming, because we're going through this with all the agencies at the same time, trying to identify what is sitting out there that we can expect to come to us eventually.

HUNT: His problem is more frightening than mine.

FERRIERO: Right.

VOGT: Richard, did you say then that you are keeping the space that you have currently at Archives I?

HUNT: That's the plan, as far as I know.

VOGT: OK.

PAUL: I think our unknown in space would tend to be things that are coming in under replevin, as much as anything. Would you agree with that, Robin?

REEDER: Yes, and when that happens, it is totally unplanned. It seems like it's every few years. It's not consistent.

HUNT: And there's no way to estimate what's out there and what's a candidate, right? Unless you do some surveys of congressional papers repositories. John?

LAWRENCE: As a bit more of a neophyte on some of these issues than some of the others around the table, I just am wondering--when I look out towards 2030, my question is to what extent we will have technology to digitize materials as opposed to dealing with these massive weight-bearing spaces -- and the rest of the world seems to want to move things to microchips. I'm just wondering if you could just talk a little bit about the technology of taking these records and converting them to digital format. Is that a reality that is being considered in this, and what kind of options are there for furthering that, which would diminish the need for volume storage facilities.

HUNT: I'll start the discussion, but I think I would like to open it up to David, and Brandon, and other committee members. It does not include digitization as relief or a solution in that we do not destroy paper, typically, after we've digitized it, because that's fragile and can disappear as well. So it would give you an option of off-site storage in the D.C. area, which we'd maintain for the House and the Senate because of the proximity to their records. The Obama Library is talking about digitizing a lot of their records, and I know that the National Archives is giving them some sort of price estimates. I haven't seen anything. That could be a model for all of us to look at and consider, depending on how that looks.

FERRIERO: But there have been no discussions about what to do with the paper if we were to get to that point where we had the very first all-digital presidential library. We still have the paper to deal with. And that's the situation across all the executive branch agencies also. We've put a stake in the ground in our new strategic plan to digitize everything, because I'm convinced that's the only way we're going to provide the level of access that

people deserve, in order to use the records. And that includes the records of Congress, but it's an expensive proposition. I'm hoping that the technology is going to get cheaper and the process easier as we move forward, but there's been no decision to dispose of paper because we have digitized. And having been in this business for too many years, I can point to many situations in our past history where we have made decisions about microfilming and destroying the originals, and have come to regret that, because the quality of the information has degraded over time. So I'm super sensitive to saying that we're going to destroy the paper once it's digitized.

LAWRENCE: If I could just follow-up. I wasn't suggesting destroying the paper records although we do have Yucca Mountain available for storage I suppose.

FERRIERO: Yeah, right.

LAWRENCE: I was thinking of digitization mainly for the retrieval purposes and eliminating the necessity of constructing and maintaining buildings in proximity to the Capitol. When we're talking about weight-bearing spaces within a mile of Capitol Hill, I'm just wondering to what extent we could take some of that weight and put it elsewhere, while still having the records retrieval capability in electronic form

FERRIERO: We have wonderful caves in Kansas that we use already, with infinite space to expand, and that's the appropriate place for paper.

HAAS: But John, I think you hit it really right on the head there, because that is one of our big challenges. When the space issue came up, and we started about what the options were, because of the need to have access to records on a daily basis for both the Senate and the House, it is a challenge. And so we really made it clear that we needed to have our records in a location that was easily accessible. But it is something that we need to have more of a plan down the road as to how we transition some of those things and see what is available. And the Archives has talked to us a little bit about that.

ADAMS: Anyone else on this topic? OK. Well thank you, Richard. I will now turn it over to Brandon Hirsch, IT specialist at the Center, who will provide us with an update on the Congressional Records Instance of the Electronic Records Archive. Brandon?

HIRSCH: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for the opportunity to provide you with a brief update of CRI and electronic records at the Center. As you've noted in the report for this meeting, we don't have plateaus in electronic records transfers. We have increased in volume by about 25 terabytes, or 40% of our holdings since we last saw each other in December. This is marked with the end of the Congress, and typical significant spikes in records transfers. Also the conclusion of the Web Harvest of the 113<sup>th</sup> Congress, which alone was over 15 terabytes. But we certainly are continuing to see exponential growth in transfers of electronic records. And given the current conversations on space, the logical next question is, "Well, where are we putting all of these things?" And you might expect that we will at some point in the near future need to acquire additional server storage space, and we're happy to announce today that we have received approval and funding to acquire over 200 terabytes of storage space for congressional records and the records of other legislative branch agencies and commissions. Our estimates indicate, based upon past transfers, that this acquisition should provide sufficient storage space for the next two to three years.

Looking out from that timeline, the agency is working on larger electronic records storage projects that we hope to brief you on in coming meetings. As we look past the next two to three years, our same estimates predict that by 2019, we will hold approximately 570 terabytes, or a half a petabyte. To put this in rough textual perspective, a half a petabyte is roughly 10 million four-drawer filing cabinets, 250 million three-and-a-half-inch floppy disks, or 250 billion pages of standard printed text. We're very thankful that we have this additional storage that's coming online very soon, and we've received outstanding support from NARA's chief information officer, and several of her staff members in the IT operations department. Without them, we wouldn't have been able to come to a solution so quickly and provide a very robust

solution for CRI for the near-and-medium-term growth. So we really look forward to continuing to work with the CIO and her team.

While this has been one of our largest projects and has maintained much of our focus for the past six months to a year, we've also noted in the report several additional projects of interest including open electronic committee records. The conclusion of the Web Harvest, which I already mentioned, and we're also looking ahead to the all-too-close date of February 2016, when the records of the Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission become available for researchers to request. So we have our focus spread across many areas, and we look forward to working with this committee and with those resources that we've had within the agency to accommodate this robust growth in electronic records. And I'd be happy to entertain any questions that any of the members have about the projects we're working on.

LEON: Just a quick one about the storage acquisition. Is that set up to enable co-location, or is it split between sites?

HIRSCH: We do have separate record storage at NARA's offsite facility in Rocket Center, and we are looking to continue that offsite storage. We're looking to acquire roughly 240 terabytes for local CRI, as well as mirroring all that storage volume at the alternate computing site. And we perform backups, of course, in each case, and send those off-site as well.

KOED: Brandon, is it a possibility that in the future we might be looking at cloud storage, or is that just security-wise, not even a possibility?

HIRSCH: It certainly is, I think, an eventual point of discussion. There are FISMA-certified federal cloud instances. Amazon has agencies that do use FISMA-certified clouds. And I think that will certainly be something that we'll be having discussions in the very near future.



FERRIERO: It certainly is the agency's strategy.

HIRSCH: Yes.

KOED: Is it?

FERRIERO: It is.

SKAGGS SPETH: Being new to the committee, I'm trying to understand the architecture of the several projects. Would it be possible to get an architectural chart for our next meeting, so I can understand how all this is put together?

HIRSCH: Certainly. We'd be happy to provide one.

SKAGGS SPETH: Thank you.

ADAMS: Thank you, Brandon. I will now turn it back to Richard, so he can give us the mid-year report on the Center's ongoing activities. Richard?

HUNT: Thank you. I just wanted to hit a few highlights. I know you've all had a chance to see the report. We have successfully moved almost 900 cubic feet of records to the Washington National Records Center, and by the end of this month there will be another thousand cubic feet moved out there, so that will give us growth space in the National Archives building. You've seen the significant increase in textual records as well as in electronic records. We've received over 2,300 cubic feet, about 6 million pages, and more than twice the quantity we took in over the same period last year.

We've made significant progress on our description project, and we're on track to complete this -- Sharon Leon's project -- by the end of fiscal year '16. Congresses 1 through 70 all have enhanced descriptions, and so do Congresses 85 through 95, so that covers 161 years of House and Senate history. We're working on the 71<sup>st</sup> Congress

through the 84<sup>th</sup> Congress, or the last 27 years that need enhanced descriptions, so the end is in sight.

You can see from the charts the good work that the House and Senate Archivists have done in creating and sharing the metadata they create on both textual and electronic records, which will serve our future researchers well. You probably figured out that this attractive cover shows some of the recent research that has been done at the Center in using House and Senate records, and you can see the great variety of topics that are covered.

We've also created Android and PDF versions of our app, "Congress Creates the Bill of Rights," and we've produced a promotional and how-to-use video that's on our website, showing users some of the features and content of the app.

My staff is playing an important part in the National Archives' National Outreach Program, with the curation of the exhibit "Amending America," as part of the 225<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Bill of Rights. We're also continuing our work with important partners in Texas, Florida, and D.C., in the educational community to improve the teaching of civics and history in middle and high schools. I'm very proud of all the good that my staff does. Questions?

ADAMS: OK. Thank you, Richard. At this time I would like to open it up to any new business. Does anyone have anything? None. OK. If there are no other comments, then I want to thank you all for attending today's meeting, and I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

F2: I move that we adjourn.

ADAMS: OK. So moved. We are adjourned. Thank you all so much.

Meeting concluded at 11:00