

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS
MEETING # 52
MONDAY, JUNE 26, 2017
CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER
MEETING ROOM NORTH

Members of the Committee Present: Karen L. Haas, Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives; Julie E. Adams, Secretary, U.S. Senate; David S. Ferriero, Archivist of the United States; Betty K. Koed, Historian, U.S. Senate; Matthew Wasniewski, Historian, U.S. House of Representatives; Sharon M. Leon, Director of Public Projects, Center for History and New Media, George Mason University; John A. Lawrence, Visiting Professor, University California, Washington, D.C., Campus; Deborah Skaggs Speth, Archivist, U.S. Senator Mitch McConnell and Elaine L. Chao Archives, University of Louisville McConnell Center; and Sheryl B. Vogt, Director, Richard B. Russell Library for Political Research and Studies, University of Georgia Libraries.

Also Present: Richard Hunt, Director, Center for Legislative Archives, National Archives and Records Administration; Karen Paul, Archivist, U.S. Senate; Elisabeth Butler, Deputy Archivist, U.S. Senate; Farar P. Elliott, Chief, Office of Art and Archives, U.S. House of Representatives; Alison Trulock, Archival Specialist, U.S. House of Representatives; and Robin Reeder, Archivist, U.S. House of Representatives.

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m., Karen Haas [Clerk of the House] presiding.

Ms. Haas. Good morning. The meeting of the Advisory Committee of the Records of Congress will now come to order.

First, let me take this opportunity to welcome the committee members: Deborah Skaggs, Sheryl Vogt, Sharon Leon, and John Lawrence. Thank you for your continued service and contributions to this committee. We currently have two vacancies on the committee, but we hope to have a Speaker appointee and a Senate Minority Leader appointee for the December meeting.

Welcome to the Secretary of the Senate, Julie Adams, and I want to thank her for her continued leadership on this committee. Also, I would like to welcome David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States, and thank you for your continued support.

At this time, I would like to preface our discussions by highlighting some developments in the Office of the Clerk since we last met. As we opened the 115th Congress, we were charged with welcoming 52 new House Members. This is a very diverse group. Among them are 20 former State legislators, 11 veterans, 4 former local government officials, 3 physicians, 2 returning House Members, 2 children of former Members, 2 television hosts, a former Governor, a former ambassador, and the first Vietnamese American and Indian American women to serve in Congress.

We have also been busy managing five vacant offices during the 115th Congress, four of which are Members who have left the House to work in the new administration. Robin has been working with us on the management of the vacant office papers.

This year, we continue celebrating the 100th anniversary of the first woman elected to Congress, Jeannette Rankin of Montana. At the last Advisory Committee meeting, we heard about the oral history project the House Historian, Matt Wasniewski, and the oral history staff have been conducting with former women Members and staff, to date completing 40 oral histories to mark the centennial.

In addition, our curatorial staff in the Office of Art and Archives researched and produced a wonderful exhibit in the Capitol documenting the history of the first woman in Congress. For those of you who haven't seen it yet, I would like to invite you to visit the connecting corridor on the first floor of the House Capitol or visit the exhibit online at history.house.gov. If you would like to visit after this meeting adjourns, House Curator Farar Elliott would be happy to escort you up to the exhibit.

At this time, I would like to yield to the distinguished Secretary of the Senate, Julie Adams.

Ms. Adams. Good morning. I am glad to be here this morning and thank the Clerk for chairing this meeting of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress.

I am pleased to welcome back Deborah Skaggs Speth, Leader McConnell's appointee, who has served since June of 2015, and Sheryl Vogt, my appointee, who has served since June of 2007. I thank them for their past service and look forward to their future contributions. I also look forward to welcoming Leader Schumer's appointee once named.

The minutes of December's meeting highlight how much we all have to do to preserve our records during major election cycles and how important it is to be prepared with good guidance to both outgoing and incoming personnel. In the Senate, we experienced a turnover of eight Members respectively.

Archivist David Ferriero's comments about raising the visibility and importance of recordkeeping apply to all three branches of government. Success in this area helps to manage large-scale transitions successfully. His work with the tech industry to help create the tools that will facilitate better recordkeeping is of interest, especially in the management of personal privacy information that needs to be protected.

I thank David for assisting our outreach efforts with new Members by hosting a dinner for them at the Archives during their November orientation. His efforts were certainly successful. Senator Harris, a former NARA intern, asked her office to reach out to our Archivist for advice almost immediately after the dinner. So those dinners do pay off. Thank you, David.

This spring, we continued our tradition of celebrating Congress Week during the first week of April to commemorate the week in 1789 when Congress achieved a quorum and began its

business. This April, Associate Senate Historian Kate Scott explored the origins, legacy, and archival record of the First Reconstruction Act of March 1867 in a special Congress Week brown bag lunch talk that also highlighted the sesquicentennial anniversary of that landmark legislation.

Also, I am pleased to note that Leader McConnell submitted a statement to the Congressional Record in recognition of Congress Week, and you will find a copy of that before you.

Finally, having just had the opportunity to visit the GPO site on Friday, I look forward to hearing an update about the renovation of this space, as well as the other reports.

Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

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

Mr. Ferriero. Thank you, and good morning.

I'll share a series of short reports on things that have happened since we last met, so this is very selective since a lot has happened.

First, I am sure you have read in the press about the Obama Presidential Record Center and a new model. In early May, we announced a new model for preservation and accessibility for Presidential records for the Obama administration. The money ordinarily devoted to building a research library, which gets turned over to the government, will be used instead to digitize all of the unclassified records. This will be the first digital Presidential library.

The Obama Foundation will build a policy Center and a museum, both to be run by the foundation, and a loan agreement between the foundation and the National Archives will be created for the use of the original paper records and artifacts in the museum.

The original paper records and artifacts will be housed in an existing NARA facility that meets our high standards for archival storage, and classified records will be stored here in Washington where they can be more efficiently and effectively secured and reviewed for declassification. In addition to the paper records, we received more than 250 terabytes of electronic records, including 300 million email messages from the Obama White House. Together, these born-digital and digitized materials will represent the largest digital archive of Presidential records. We have a lot to work out in the interim in terms of service models and access to the records and thinking around a digital Presidential record Center going beyond the Obama Presidency. So an exciting time.

In early April, we received from the Office of Management and Budget something known as memorandum M-17-22, which is entitled "Comprehensive Plan for Reforming the Federal Government and Reducing the Federal Workforce." It outlines several actions for each executive branch agency, the first being the development of an agency reform plan. This calls

for the review of programs and activities to ensure that every function is operating efficiently and effectively and is contributing to the core agency mission. We must identify activities which are duplicative, nonessential, or are not operating efficiently or effectively and propose actions to address these activities. The agency reform plans will be incorporated into our fiscal year 2019 budget and new strategic plan. Initial reform ideas and draft strategic goals and objectives are due to OMB at the end of this week.

In September, we submit refined drafts to OMB, along with our fiscal year 2019 budget submission, and will spend the fall in deliberations with OMB and publish our final agency reform plan and strategic plan in February of 2018.

You have read in the press, I am sure, about a recent theft. One of the biggest challenges we have is the balance between protection of the records and making them available to the public. The latest violation of trust was the theft of World War II era dog tags stolen from College Park by a private researcher. Between October 2015 and June 9th of this year, historian Antonin DeHays stole dog tags and other documents relating to U.S. servicemen whose planes had crashed during World War II. He sold them on eBay, and some were presented as gifts to museums. DeHays has been arrested, charged, and is cooperating with the U.S. attorney for the District of Maryland and our inspector general. He faces a maximum sentence of 10 years in prison.

If you haven't seen our "Amending America" exhibit, you have until September to do it. This is an exhibit that tells the story of how the Constitution can be amended, and the 11,000 attempts over time to do so. And on Veteran's Day, we open "Remembering Vietnam," the story of the Vietnam War. In March of 2019, the exhibit will be "Woman Suffrage and the 19th Amendment."

We have a new app on World War I. With the support of our anonymous donor, on the 100th anniversary of the U.S. entry into World War I, we launched an app, which includes photographs, documents, audiovisual recordings, educational resources, article blogs, lectures, and exhibits. And in commemoration of this event, we launched the World War I research portal with the goal of creating a central space for all National Archives' resources and content related to the war that can be mined by researchers, students, educators, and those curious about it. And I am most proud of the fact that this app is a collaborative effort led by the National Archives, but also includes content from the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian. This is historic for the three institutions to do anything together. That is my report.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, David.

Our next order of business is 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?

Hearing none, I would entertain a motion to approve and second.

Voice. I move.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

The next item of business is I would like to invite the committee members to provide any updates they might like to provide on work that they have been doing.
Sheryl?

Ms. Vogt. I will just share a couple of things with you. J. Roy Rowland, who was the dean of the Georgia delegation in the House back in the late 1980s, early 1990s, has just completed his memoirs that debuted this month. It is called "House Call." He is a physician. So I think that is a clever title. He writes about his work on the first healthcare plan during the Clinton administration. It is very much behind the scenes, very candid, and for that reason alone I think you would enjoy it.

And I would also like to say that I do not live in Georgia's Sixth District, but I feel like the people in Iowa must feel every time there is a Presidential election. So I am very glad that that has been resolved, at least for the time being. We will revisit it again, I guess, in like 18 months, but we have a respite. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thanks, Sheryl. Anyone else? Sharon.

Ms. Leon. I would just say that the lovely folks at the Archives Leadership Institute, which runs a week each year to train up-and-coming, best and brightest of archivists in the country, have started without me this week. Today is the beginning of the second day in Berea, Kentucky, and I am on my way there tomorrow to spend the rest of the week with them. It is one of my favorite things each year, and what I would say is that, in the applicant pool, we get a sort of smattering of folks from Federal service, but not nearly as many as I think we could and would like. So I want to mention to everybody in the room who is committed to the service and care of archives to consider participating in the Archives Leadership Institute. It is a really wonderful week, and it is a wonderful networking opportunity of relationships and coworkers that continue to launch projects well into their careers from this workshop, and it is kindly funded by NHPRC at the National Archives. So, off I go tomorrow, and I hope some of you will eventually join us.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. John?

Mr. Lawrence. I want to thank people in the room, as opposed to advertising. I just finished the book that I have been working on for the last 4 years on the House class of 1974 and the rise of partisanship, and there are a lot of people in this room who have been very helpful in encouraging and helping with the research. It will be coming out on March 1 with Johns Hopkins Press. So I am very happy to have that project behind me, but I am also really excited about it coming out.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. At this time, let me recognize Robin Reeder for an update on our activities.

Ms. Reeder. Thank you. To begin with, here are the statistics from our last Advisory Committee meeting. We had 21 consultations with Members; 2 with committees; catalogued 423 photos; textual records transferred to the Center for Legislative Archives was 828,000 pages;

electronic records transferred to the Center for Legislative Archives was 28.6 gigabytes; and loans to committees totaled 149,250 pages.

I would like to highlight some of the projects our staff members have been working on. We closed out the 114th Congress and started to work on the 115th Congress. Part of a normal start to a Congress includes working with the Clerk to send letters offering archival consultations to new Members and returning Members who have never had archival consultations, as well as letters to the committee chairs asking for records access, authorization sheets, and offering records management advice.

Also, part of our tasks for the beginning of a Congress includes collecting the Speaker election tally sheet, their certificates of election, and the oaths of office. We request photographs from new Members and those who have not previously provided images to update the online Biographical Directory of Congress.

We have received 72 images for this Congress and added these photos to the Biographical Directory. We also have been working on the Advisory Committee's *Sixth Report* with Farar Elliott, who will be talking about this a little later in this meeting. We are aiming to have drafts of it to send to the Committee at the end of October.

Heather Bourk worked on coordinating the transfer of records to be moved to temporary storage at the Washington National Records Center. The records will remain there until the space at the Government Publishing Office is renovated. Heather is also working on inventorying the House Photography Studio collection of photographs to prepare for their transfer to NARA's Still Pictures in the fall. There are approximately 250 FRC boxes of images and negatives documenting House Members and events.

Heather completed the transfer of records from the Select Committee on Benghazi with the receipt of 22 gigabytes of electronic records in addition to 260 boxes of textual records already transferred. And, currently, she is working on processing electronic records received during the 113th Congress, and orphan textual records for transfer later this year.

Michelle Strizever has been working with the House Historian's Office to find additional images for the "Women in Congress" e-book. This edition will have 94 new images, most of which are from the House collection. She is also working with the Historian's Office on researching images and writing captions for the upcoming "Asian and Pacific Islanders Americans in Congress" publication.

Along with Alison Trulock and Stephanie Grimes, Michelle presented on a panel about *Record Search* at the Society for History in the Federal Government Conference, which took place at the National Archives. Michelle discussed the details of digital asset management for *Record Search* files and explained how they are added to the website. She also gave a talk at the Society for Textual Scholarship Conference, which took place at the Maryland Institute for Technology in the Humanities, to introduce *Record Search* to other researchers and scholars.

Michelle worked with an intern in the House Historian's Office, who assisted with *Record Search*, research and writing, and helped Michelle do a full inventory of the photo collection. To promote photographs from the House collection, they crafted a month-long Twitter campaign that showed a detail from a photo and asked users to guess which photo it was from and then tweeted out the full photo a few minutes later. The campaign doubled the usual rate of user engagement with the *U.S. House History* Twitter account.

Alison Trulock completed archival research and wrote content for the digital and physical exhibits on Jeannette Rankin that launched in March, and she also worked on locating archival documents for the upcoming "Minorities in Congress" publication on "Asian and Pacific Islanders in Congress." As I mentioned earlier, she chaired and presented a panel on *Record Search* at the annual meeting of the Society for History in the Federal Government with Michelle and Stephanie, and she and Stephanie also demonstrated *Record Search* in the exhibit hall at the Annual Conference on Museums and the Web in Cleveland, Ohio. They wrote a paper for the conference that is available online.

Alison served as a national history judge for the nationals on June 12th and 13th, judging websites and exhibits in the junior and senior divisions, respectively. Finally, Alison was selected to serve a 4-year term on the editorial board for the *American Archivist*, which starts this July.

Currently, Alison is working on coordinating and preparing for the upcoming transfer of the 113th Congress records to NARA. She also has been busy overseeing the continued development of our *Record Search* project that we introduced to you all at the last meeting, and I would like to now let you hear from Alison about the updates of the database since then.

Ms. Trulock. Good morning. As I reported at the ACRC meeting in December, we launched *Record Search* in October 2016 with 109 records. Since then, Archives has been working to promote the project as well as add new content. In December, we shared *Record Search* with a preconference program for teachers as part of the National Council for the Social Studies Annual Conference. We received positive response, including useful feedback about the features they liked as well as how we can make *Record Search* more useful for teachers and students.

In April, I chaired a panel at the annual meeting of the Society for History in Federal Government that presented *Record Search* along with photo archivist Michelle Strizever and digital content specialist Stephanie Grimes. The panel covered how we created the project from the perspectives of content design and implementation. The panel was well attended and seemed to inspire other agencies to work to undertake similar initiatives.

Also in April, Stephanie and I attended the Annual Conference of Museums and the Web in Cleveland. We were selected to contribute a paper, which is available online, as well as to demo *Record Search* in the exhibit hall for the conference. It was useful to promote *Record Search* to new audiences in the tech and museum fields, and they were excited to see a project based on archival material.

Also, about a week ago, we added our first new content since launch in October with 23 new documents for a total of 132 documents. New research includes a poignant letter asking for Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday to be a national holiday, Eero Saarinen's original plan for the grounds of the Gateway Arch in St. Louis, Missouri, and a resolution asking for the Irish nationalists responsible for the Easter Rising to be treated as prisoners of war. Other documents include records related to Prohibition, discovery of the North Pole, Social Security, school prayer, and the Chicago Stock Yards. We are planning to add another 20 or so documents by the end of 2017, most of which is new research. At that point, *Record Search* will include at least one record from each of the standing committees that has records open under the 30-year access rule.

I will close with a few stats from our analytics. Since November 1, 2016, 3,303 users have visited *Record Search*. Users are looking at an average of about 2 pages per visit, and most users are coming to *Record Search* from Florida, California, D.C., and Texas. Users are primarily coming to the site from Google. However, we are able to track that many people are also bookmarking pages and showing that they are returning to the content and reusing it, which is great.

The top three most visited records are the conference report on the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the testimony of Senator Albert Brown on the assault of Senator Charles Sumner by Preston Books in 1856, and the 1916 election certificate of Jeannette Rankin. Users are spending an average of about 3.5 minutes on a page. And, actually, 58 seconds to a minute is about the average for most web pages. So we really think that is great. It shows engagement. William Claiborne's 1803 proclamation to the people of New Orleans welcoming the new territory and assuring its citizens of their continued protection is apparently so fascinating that users are spending nearly 7 minutes on that page, which is about double the average. As always, we continue to look for feedback, both on the content and the usability of Record Search. So please let us know if you have any suggestions. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Alison. Thank you, Robin. Karen, would you like to update us on your activities?

Ms. Paul. Thank you.

The first thing I'll report on is Senators' records preservation. We had eight Senators' offices close and are pleased to report that seven Members elected to preserve their records in an archival repository. We used our handbook, "Preserving Senate History: Closing a Senator's Office," which details steps involved in preserving a legacy collection. We think being able to see the whole picture and understanding the scope of the job has inspired retiring Members, especially those who have served for a while, to hire professional archival assistants, and five have done so this time.

This edition of "Preserving Senate History" includes a new form for offices to track and describe their digital records. The offices with professional archival help were able to incorporate the digital curating guidance developed by our NDSR fellow. In conjunction with the Senate Sergeant at Arms, we updated and used a final countdown to-do list with necessary forms to allow closing offices to streamline a fairly complex process. We emphasized setting aside

enough time for digital archiving and recommended that offices begin the process around December 1, 2016, giving them a full month to complete the task.

We reached out to new Members through the 2017 edition of the handbook, "The Senate: The First 60 Days," which gives records management and other advice for set-up of new offices. We held a seminar for new Members entitled "New Members: Senator's Office Records Management Best Practices," and we are meeting with new offices individually to follow up and present our office archives toolkit now in its seventh edition. Our goal is to provide practical hands-on advice that can be applied incrementally as a new office settles more into a routine. We also led a brown bag discussion on the topic of, yes, you guessed it, "Spotlight on Records: Senator's Office Records Management and Archives," and this was sponsored by the Senate Chief Counsel for Employment.

And last, working with Senator McCaskill's counsel/archivist, we developed a new Senator's office records management and archiving plan, which is an actual working plan with detailed implementation steps and recommendations for best practices in the Senator's office *Archives Toolkit*. So it was thrilling for us to help an office actually build on the modules of best practice in the *Toolkit* and make a workable plan. This is proving to be popular with new offices and also some of the older ones.

We also reached out to State offices through a video seminar on the topic of archives and records management for State offices. And as previously mentioned, as part of our outreach to Members, we used the occasion of Congress Week, April 1st through 7th, to develop a statement about records preservation for the majority leader to submit to the Congressional Record. And we have shared a copy of that with you today, and I would love to have engraved in stone the statement as follows: "The American people have placed their confidence in our ability to effect meaningful change for the good of the country, and may we honor this sacred trust by keeping detailed archives of the work we do here."

For committee records preservation from December to the present, Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler processed 214 accessions of textual records from 16 different committees totaling 700 cubic feet and 20.7 terabytes from 13 committees. By "processing" I mean that she received and copied the electronic records; reviewed, corrected, and enhanced the descriptive information contained on the transfer records, documenting each accession; uploaded the information to the Archives Toolkit, our accession database; and for committees without archivists, she created directory lists and ran format ID and File Fixity checks on the digital accessions prior to their transfer to the Center, again incorporating our NDSR Fellow recommendations into our own office workflow.

Of note, we worked with the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies staff to determine the best organization, content, and records format of their archives with an eye toward capturing complete documentation and arranging it so that it would be useful for the next inaugural committee. We preserved 12.5 cubic feet of textual records and a still-to-be-determined amount of electronic records.

We continue to work on obtaining final approval of the Fifth Edition of the *Records Management Handbook for United States Senate Committees*, but this effort has been impeded by several changes in staffing.

We have begun to work on what we are hoping will be a multi-module training program covering basic archiving principles, procedures, and records management for Senate staff, including staff directors, office managers, archivists, systems administrators, and legislative staff. We have developed an initial script and a PowerPoint presentation for what would become the first module, a basic briefing entitled "Introduction to Senate Archives: What Staff Need to Know." Modules for acquisition and appraisal, and accessioning, arrangement, and description, also are being developed.

We envision the fully developed suite as a course, that when completed by staff, will receive an archiving certificate from the Secretary of the Senate. We also are exploring ways to deliver this information electronically and are looking at in-house examples, such as a recent online security training that incorporated a quiz. In addition, we have identified a Massachusetts County Clerk archival training program that is supposed to become available through the Society of American Archivists this fall. And if any of our committee members know of other possible training models or examples that we might take a look at, please let us know about them. We will be presenting all of these ideas and suggestions to the Secretary of the Senate for discussion and approval, and then we will explore options in funding and implementation.

I wanted to mention a couple of noteworthy accessions in progress. While the Democratic Policy Committee has been archiving with some regularity, the Republican Conference had chosen to retain its older records until last summer, when they began to archive records from the early 1980s. Working on this material, we were pleased to find a copy of our first edition of our records management handbook for U.S. Senators published in 1985. This was a trip down memory lane for me personally, as I recalled working on that project with Conference staffer Patty Jackson, an indefatigable promoter of archiving to her Conference members.

Another accession we are working on includes Environment and Public Works Committee records relating to the investigation of the BP oil spill in 2010. Along with a smattering of textual records, the bulk of this documentation consists of electronic records totaling over 13 terabytes and containing a large number of proprietary formats.

We continue to accession committee hearing videos from the Senate recording studio, most recently from the 111th Congress. These are the Senate's master recordings of hearings with some occasional markup meetings included.

We also continue to work on social media archiving. Prior to the end of each Congress, we communicate with all committees about the advisability of accurately capturing committee social media records that may not remain accessible due to changes in institutional or committee leadership and the attendant changes to committee accounts. Deputy Archivist Alison White has worked with committees as well as Members' offices on archiving these materials. Based on information gathered during our work at the end of the 114th Congress, we determined that those

offices that are using one of the Senate-approved vendors are receiving a better and more complete final product.

So, currently, the National Archives accepts web archive files, referred to as WARC files, which is the preferred format for web-accessible content in the archived state. We are suggesting that offices collect these WARC files in addition to content and metadata files in PDF, text, HTML, and XML. Because the process of downloading these records can be repetitious, take a considerable amount of time and computer resources, and is rarely without glitches, Deputy Archivist White has stepped in to assist offices without archivists on staff who request such assistance. We have collected some form of documentation for over 26 social media accounts from 12 committees thus far, with six of these committees using a vendor to archive 20 social media accounts. And most of our Members who retired also followed this practice and archived their social media accounts.

I think one way to measure the value of an archives program is to consider the number of loans made back to the record creators. During the past 6 months and the beginning of a new administration -- last December -- Senate committees requested 152 separate loans totaling 602 boxes. For perspective, in a normal year, the Center normally processes around 200 loans total House and Senate. So that was quite an uptick. Many of the borrowed records were related to committee work on nominations.

So we especially thank the staff at the Center, Richard and Merrily Harris, for the superb service they gave to us during this very busy time. You even went the extra mile and developed a new way for us to contact you so that several of your staff get our message at once and respond immediately. And I have to tell you that we have heard many, many thanks from grateful staff that we are passing on to you.

Mr. Hunt. That is very nice to hear.

Ms. Paul. Deputy Archivist White is participating in two Senate Sergeant-at-Arms Technology Assessment Group working groups. One is developing a digital asset management system for Senate offices to assist with photo and video management, and the other is looking at electronic communication platforms for project management. We feel it is very important to have an archivist on these working groups to assure that the ability to archive Senate records from new platforms is a criteria for consideration of any end product that is adopted.

For constituent services system data we continue to monitor progress on enabling CSS system data to be accessible and usable when donated to a Member's archival repository, and a number of our retiring Members this past time selected the more robust data download that was offered for the first time at the close of the Congress. Deputy Archivist White is working with the Congressional Papers Section Task Force on CSS data, and they are working on a white paper addressing how it is created and used in an active office and how it is offered and delivered to repositories, while also proposing strategies and solutions to enable repositories to work with this data and make it accessible to researchers at such time that it might become available. We expect the white paper to be available in time for the Society of American Archivists' annual meeting in July.

I have an NDSR, National Digital Stewardship Residency, footnote. After a year as a host mentor in the Washington, D.C., cohort of the residency program, Deputy Archivist White recently attended a symposium on the program and participated in a workshop to develop standardized guidelines and a handbook for NDSR residencies. The symposium focused on different project implementations, the role of mentors' expectations and funding and sustainability of this program as a national model.

We are sad to announce that the Commerce Committee archivist, Matt Stahl, has resigned from his post on the committee to take up a position as University Archivist of the University of California Santa Barbara. From July 2013 through June 2017, Matt served the committee with distinction and has created a superior archival collection process for the committee. But we are happy for him as he moves back with his children of 2-and-a-half and 5 to be near his and his wife's families. During his time with the committee, he completed 80 accessions, of which 54 were e-record accessions and 37 were textual. The total textual volume was 233 cubic feet, and the electronic volume was 1.4 terabytes. I think that is a good example of the change from textual records being highest in volume to electronic records being highest in volume in a very typical committee.

But we are also pleased to introduce today Sarah Schmitz, Matt's successor. Sarah graduated in May from the University of Maryland with a master of library and information science degree and a specialization in archives and digital curation. While working on her degree, she held internships at the National Park Service, the White House Historical Association, and the Center for Legislative Archives. This is not her first time on the Senate payroll, because from 2007 to 2010, Sarah was a staff assistant on the Senate Health Committee assigned with archiving tasks. In fact, it was her experience on the committee which led her to pursue her professional degree as an archivist and come back to the Senate. So, welcome, Sarah.

The Association of Centers for the Study of Congress held its annual meeting at the Library of Congress from May 10-12, 2017. ACSC is an independent alliance of more than 50 political papers repositories that promote the history and understanding of Congress. This year's theme, "Centers for the Study of Congress: Connecting and Communicating," was explored through 12 panel discussions.

We have provided you with a very good detailed summary of the meeting prepared by Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler and John Caldwell, our former Senate Historical Office fellow. I do urge you to read that because there are some really helpful details in the report that present the procedures and techniques that the Library of Congress Manuscript Division is employing to manage its textual and digital collections, which are growing as ours are. The highlights of the meeting included a conversation between Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell and McConnell Center Archivist, Deborah Skaggs Speth; an interview with former Representative Barney Frank and his long-serving Chief of Staff, Peter Kovar; and a keynote by Dr. Colleen Shogan, Deputy Director of the Library of Congress National and International Outreach. I would like to ask Deborah to say a few words, and also her picture is on page 2 of the handout.

Ms. Skaggs Speth. Okay. It was my pleasure to welcome and participate with Senator Majority Leader McConnell in an interview-style session during the recent annual meeting of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress held at the Library of Congress. The May 10th session discussion ranged from the contents of his archives, which includes extensive family records, comprehensive Senate office records, the importance of his in-house archivist's work, Nan Mosher, overseeing current recordkeeping as well as disposition of archival records, and establishing his archives at the University of Louisville 8 years ago.

When asked what advice he had to convince other Senators about the value of an in-house archivist, he stressed that we needed to convince Members of the archival importance of their papers. We also learned that he was under the impression that many Senators already had employed an in-house archivist. I think he was surprised about the number. He spoke highly of their value. The Majority Leader also highlighted the importance of conducting oral history interviews. He began his oral history program back in the eighties. He spoke highly of their value for the research and writing of his recent memoir, "The Long Game." At the end of the session, it was apparent that he enjoyed his time with us.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

Mr. Ferriero. Can I just add that the Massachusetts training program you mentioned is another project funded by NHPRC.

Ms. Paul. Wow, that's great.

Ms. Haas. I would like to recognize Director of the Center for Legislative Archives Richard Hunt to report on his activities.

Mr. Hunt. Thank you. Let me start with an update on GPO Building A. It is getting exciting that we are past the planning and design phase, and now we are actually going to see some activity occur.

On May 19th of this year, GPO issued the solicitation for the work on the renovation of Building A. I would remind people that this is going to yield 65,000 cubic feet plus of records storage space for House and Senate records. June 28th, this Wednesday, bids and proposals are due to GPO, and then they estimate they will take 30 days or so to award the contract. There should be some analysis and some exchange of information between GPO and bidders.

The estimated time for completion when the bidder is on board would be in the late summer of 2018. After taking occupancy, the Center will need a month or two to map the shelving into the agency's holdings management system and to apply bar codes to each shelf, so we can track the records' movement. The records that will be moved would begin in the fall of 2018.

Currently, we have close to 7,000 cubic feet of House and Senate records in temporary storage space at the Washington National Records Center and in a borrowed stack space in Archives I. Moving this volume of 7,000 cubic feet of records will require 13 separate truckloads to be

delivered to the new space at GPO. This additional space will offer significant benefits to the Center and to our level of records services that we provide to the House and the Senate. We will be able to take in and store together a whole Congress worth of records, as was done for the first 80 Congresses in our space at Archives I. That system broke down with the massive increase in the volume of House and Senate records created by modern Congresses, and it has created significant challenges in our loan services, and also with description and reference services. The GPO space will allow us to restore a higher level of organization and service on modern records, and all new accessions will be stored in that space.

We have also done some planning at the managerial level and had informal discussions of the impact of this new space on our current staff of 20 folks. In July and August, we, the managers, will hold a series of formal discussions with Center staff to ensure that all have the opportunity to contribute their input to the planning process as we collectively face these new responsibilities and demands.

On the staffing front, as you know, we lost five experienced staff members to retirement last year, and we have filled four of those vacancies, including one position that provides dedicated support to the loan and records accessioning functions. Our loan team is comprised of that new employee, Greg Shavers, and three veteran employees who bring years of experience to the congressional loan operation.

Additionally, we have hired two new talented archivists, Dot Alexander and Sarah Waitz. They have joined the team and they have been trained in the loan process and have been backfilling as necessary. We have also revised our policies and procedures under Merrily Harris' leadership for the loan function so that any staff member can assist in the pulling and delivering of loans. It is all hands on deck. Given that our holdings have expanded significantly and demand for our services continues to go up, we need every hand to help.

Taking a look at the Center highlights for the midyear, I would like to support Karen's observation: The loan activity has been running at a historical high for the opening months of the 115th Congress, more than doubling from comparative periods of time from previous Congresses, and we have delivered close to a million pages of records to Congress since January.

We have also completed two significant projects of interest to this committee. First, we have completed the data migration of over 30 million files from the old Congressional Records Instance (CRI) system to the new one. The close of the 114th Congress resulted in the transfer of a high volume of electronic records and created a significant growth in the volume of records requiring data processing. Fortunately, the new CRI system has enhanced our ability to do that processing and prepare the records for transfer into the permanent preservation system at Rocket Center, and we are on track to complete that processing of unprocessed materials this summer and deliver them.

Second, we have completed the legislative enhanced archival description project, creating over 19,000 enhanced descriptions in the catalogue for House and Senate records for the first 96 Congresses. Sharon Leon, the architect of that project, has endowed a great legacy for the House

and Senate and for researchers in the future. And thanks to Jacqie Ferry and others for their leadership and dedicated work on the project.

On the outreach front, the highlight has been the growth in scale and scope over the past few years of our educational outreach. New partnerships have been formed with the Federal Reserve Banks in Atlanta, Dallas, and St. Louis to reach teachers in new regions and States and to expand our offerings into the field of economics, which provide lessons rich in skills related to science, technology, engineering, and math.

The growth of our educational outreach program is especially noteworthy, as it has been driven by an increasing demand for our successful teacher workshops. Charlie Flanagan has been invited back many times to Florida and Texas to do new workshops, and we have been collaborating with our partners throughout the year to design and create new workshops and new materials to meet the needs of classroom teachers. You will notice Charlie is missing. He is in Dallas doing a workshop, and he will be busy with 10 workshops in six States this summer in Florida, Texas, West Virginia, Georgia, Illinois, and Missouri. And I will point out, on the efficiency front and cost effectiveness, that our partners pay all travel costs.

I will be happy to answer any questions about the report.

Ms. Haas. Thank you Richard.

I would just like to mention, on the GPO project, you have done a great job at updating us so far with regular updates, but we haven't had a lot to report on.

Mr. Hunt. Right.

Ms. Haas. But now we should start seeing some things. The date and timeline that you have laid out for this project I think is critical for us to be able to meet our responsibilities in transferring the records. So I want to thank you for the work so far, and we want to continue to work closely together as this project continues.

Mr. Hunt. Thanks for your support.

Ms. Haas. Absolutely. John?

Mr. Lawrence. Richard and Karen, you both mentioned this uptick in demand for loans compared to other comparable periods, and I am wondering: Is it because we have more people on staffs who are demanding records who now know where to go? And if so, that gives you guys pats on the back. Do you have any sense of what is driving that demand because I think, Karen, you mentioned three times the level of other comparable time frames.

Ms. Paul. I have never seen anything like it. Of course, we have had administrative changes before but not this amount of demand.

Ms. Butler. Can I add something to that? I know, in one case, we had a ranking Member from one committee move to become ranking Member of another committee. His staff came from a

committee with an archivist, and they went to a committee without an archivist. They then started asking us about the records of this particular committee. And this committee had never requested its past records before. So that was a case of a staff that had gotten used to having an archivist now asking questions about the records of its current committee. So we saw an uptick of loans from that committee, which had not requested loans before. In that case, it was the experience of having archivists on staff at a previous committee that made them ask about the past records on their new committee. That was good to see.

Mr. Hunt. The most obvious thing we have seen is increased activity on the nomination front, which is scary, given that they have still left a lot of positions unfilled. And then I assume, since there is unified Republican government, they are digging in on their agenda items and looking at previous attempts and explorations of various topics.

Mr. Lawrence. I don't mean to take too much time on this. I am just curious. Is the demand, this enhanced demand, remaining consistent, or was it greater at the time of the transition and has now fallen back down?

Ms. Paul. You mean, by now, it has fallen off? Yes somewhat.

Mr. Lawrence. There was more towards the beginning?

Ms. Paul. What was interesting about it this time was in the past if someone had been nominated previously, and a file existed, then was appointed to another position, it was normal to pull that one file back. But this time the staff called for everything historically created on that person. They were calling back files from 15 to 20 years ago. They seemed to be not only documenting individual nominees, but also to be looking at the process and precedents involved with the approval process as well. I found that fascinating.

Mr. Lawrence. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Richard.

At this time, I would like to recognize Senate Historian Betty Koed, who will update us on the oral history project on which she has been working.

Ms. Koed. Thank you. I have some slides to share. We have a lot of exciting projects underway in the Historical Office, and I am going to highlight just one very briefly and then move into our oral history project.

First, I want to note that we have breathed new life and energy into the Foreign Relations Committee Historical Series. This is a multi-volume collection of transcripts of the executive sessions of the Foreign Relations Committee. The Historical Office assumed responsibility for this project back in the 1970s. The last volume was published in 2010 for the 1968 volume. After that, due to office workload frankly, and also some difficulty with committee staff, the project languished for a few years. But I am delighted to report that we now have it back on track, and we are moving ahead quickly with it. This is due in good part to the work of

my associate historian, Kate Scott, who has taken the lead on this project. Kate and our assistant historian Dan Holt and I are all part of that team.

With the 1969 and 1970 volumes that we are now working on, we have instituted an entirely new methodology for the project. Working with Senate Security and the Secretary's information tech team, we are completing all the work prior to declassification and publication within the confines of Senate Security. That means we now no longer have a safe in the Historical Office and we don't have to lock doors in the Historical Office, and no more single-paper copies of edited transcripts without a backup system, which had been a problem in the past. All the work is being done in a secure location on secured computer equipment. We have scanned and text converted all the transcripts from the 1969 and 1970 hearings, and we are now editing and doing the annotations of those needed to prepare for declassification and publication.

We have established an excellent working relationship with the Foreign Relations Committee and particularly with the committee's chief clerk, who has been extremely helpful in moving this project forward. And as part of the ongoing task, Kate Scott has also been doing research in the private paper collections of some of the key Senators of that era of committee history. Most notably, she recently completed research in the papers of Stuart Symington at the Missouri State Historical Society. In 1969 and 1970, William Fulbright was the chair of the Foreign Relations Committee. He certainly was a central figure in the process. But the executive session hearings of 1969 and 1970 have revealed to us the vital role played by Symington in the ongoing discussions of foreign policy during the era of the Vietnam War. Kate's research into the Symington papers has been extremely helpful in highlighting the hearings and putting them into a broader context to better understand his particular role on the committee, and to give us a deeper understanding of the issues involved. All of that, of course, helps us in editing and annotating the transcripts, and it serves as yet another reminder of just how important it is to save Members' papers.

Now on to our oral history project. Since 1975, when the Historical Office opened its doors, Senate historians have conducted nearly 700 interviews with more than 170 individuals. When the project began, my predecessors focused their efforts on interviewing Senate officers and staff. They believed that long-serving staff, rather than Senators, were more likely to have an institutional perspective, and there is a lot of truth to that statement.

If you interview people like former parliamentarian Floyd Riddick, or former Secretary of the Senate Bill Hildenbrand, or the three chief clerks of the Foreign Relation Committee from 1947 to 1977, Francis Wilcox, Carl Marcy, and Pat Holt, these people have made major contributions to Senate history and have a wonderful institutional perspective. They also left Senators out of the project, for the most part, because they assumed that every Senator would have ample opportunity to do an oral history interview either as part of their own personal archival process, like Senator McConnell does, or with another institution such as a Presidential library. For some, that proved to be true. But we have found that many have been ignored. And for those who did do interviews with Presidential libraries, for example, the interviews typically are all about the President and very little about the Senator, and even less about the institution of the Senate, not surprisingly. This would prove to be an inadequate solution to this issue.

Also, my colleagues and I have dedicated our careers to studying the Senate. So we personally bring to the interview process an institutional perspective that you won't get from anywhere else.

So now, more than 4 decades after its creation, the Senate Oral History Project is a treasure trove of institutional memory, but when I became historian 2 years ago I had to acknowledge the project had two large missing pieces. One was Senators. 1,971 individuals have served in the Senate since 1789. But by 2015, only five were included in the Oral History Project. Without the inclusion of Senators, what do you have? An incomplete story. Particularly, long-serving Senators have a unique institutional perspective of their own that comes with that election certificate. It has to be preserved.

The other missing piece was women. When I joined the office in 1998, I found only three women included in the Oral History Collection. "Why don't we have more women in this collection," I asked. Well there weren't any women to interview they told me. Immediately, I began to compile a list of women who had served as chief of staff to Senators since 1947 when implementation of the Legislative Reorganization Act authorized that position. There were seven in 1948, and the number has been steadily growing ever since. In fact, in my research, I have found women who served in top positions on committees and in Members' offices as early as 1911. That history also needs to be reflected in the Oral History Project.

So all of this is prelude to my main point. When I became historian 2 years ago, working alongside my deputy historian, Kate Scott, I redefined the focus and the scope of the project. The first step was to establish project guidelines. Prior to 2015, the Historical Office had worked with a set of assumed guidelines, but nothing formal had ever been adopted. Working closely with the Secretary of the Senate and the Assistant Secretary as well as their legal counsel, we did just that. We formalized many long-standing practices, but also clarified issues of inclusion, access, and publication. This was done not only to help us expand the project, but to help better define our role in it and to protect the prerogatives of the project itself. After that, it was full speed ahead.

Of course, there are only three Senate historians, so we can't interview every single Senator, along with officers and staff. But we hope to interview a selection of long-serving, retired, or about to retire, Senators during each Congress. Kate recently completed a comprehensive oral history, a total of 20 interviews with former Senator Carl Levin of Michigan. I am currently interviewing former Senator John Warner of Virginia. We have done eight interviews so far. Both Senators can boast of long Senate careers, 30 years for Warner, 36 for Levin. But they also had extensive service as chair or ranking member of the Armed Services Committee. Together, these two oral histories provide almost a textbook of American foreign policy and military affairs since the 1970s.

We are already in discussion with Senator Pat Leahy of Vermont to start interviews with him as his retirement date approaches, and we are considering a number of others to be interviewed in the months ahead. If we could capture the memories of Senator Orrin Hatch, for example, that would not only complement the Leahy interview, in terms of service on the Judiciary Committee, just as one example, but also as the experiences of being President pro tempore of the Senate.

And last, but certainly not least, we have launched our *Women of the Senate* oral history project. This is a wonderful complement to the House's project that they also have underway. Looking ahead to upcoming milestones, the centennial commemoration of Senate passage of the Women's Suffrage Amendment in 1919, and then ratification in 1920, as well as the service of the Senate's first female Member in 1922, Rebecca Felton, we are conducting a series of interviews with former and current Senators and select female staff. For this project, we have some specific objectives in mind. We will document the evolving role of women in the Senate and their impact on the institution and its operations and procedures, to explore the individual and collective experiences of women Senators, to explore the origins and development of women Senators' bipartisan meetings, to study the history of election and reelection campaigns of women Senators, to learn about the legislative priorities and accomplishments of these women, to identify and explore the experience of female committee chairs and ranking members, to discuss the role of women in political leadership, and to document the long and evolving story of women on Senate staff.

Our first priority is to interview former female Senators. We have already completed interviews with Carol Moseley Braun, Kay Bailey Hutchison, and Blanche Lincoln. This week I am interviewing Barbara Mikulski. Next month it will be Nancy Kassebaum, and we will continue on from there.

Once we have interviewed all former Senators, we will turn our attention to current female Senators. Meanwhile, we have also begun interviewing selected female staff. And I will name just a few: Linda Gustitis, former chief of staff to Carl Levin; Elizabeth Letchworth, former Republican Party secretary; and the first female pages, including Paulette Desell and Ellen McConnell, who are pictured on this slide back in the 1970s.

Unlike our standard life review oral histories, these interviews for the *Women of the Senate* Project will be specific to Senate service. They will focus on the women's experiences in the Senate, and issues of gender in American politics and the Federal workforce. And for the first time, we are video recording our interviews with women Senators. In the past, we have only done audio recordings for our Oral History Project. In addition to saving a substantial amount of personal and institutional history of the Senate, these interviews will provide material for commemorative events, talks and tours, and web features in the years ahead. Of course as with all Senators, the interviews with female Senators will be a valuable complement to their archival collections.

So this will take us a long way towards filling those missing pieces in the Senate's Oral History Project. We have a lot of other great projects underway, but I will stop with just these two ongoing projects that have found new life and new scope in the Senate Historical Office. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Betty.

One of the projects we are working on for the Advisory Committee outside of these meetings is the Sixth Report, documenting the activities of the committee from 2013 through 2018. Farar

Elliott will give us some background on the history of the committee, as well as past reports and the topics that will be covered in the upcoming Sixth Report.
Farar.

Ms. Elliott. Thank you.

This is an update on the progress of the Sixth Report, and probably there are a number of us here who were not here for the Fifth Report. The report will be released in 2018. But since the last report was 6 years ago, I want to set the stage for the work of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress (ACRC) in this report by reviewing, briefly, the background of Congress' care of its records, the work of Congress that brought the ACRC into being, the role the ACRC plays in Congress' official records, the records of the committees, and the officers of the House and the Senate.

So the Congress, as we have seen today, produces a lot of rich archival material. The House and the Senate themselves require use of that material to conduct research on past work and plan for future work. For the public, the story of Congress is best told through its own records and documentation. The struggle to comprehend all of that richness, the variety of official records, has been going on for generations and generations. Since the beginning of the first Federal Congress, the Secretary and the Clerk have been custodians of the documentary history of Congress.

Tracing the events that led to the establishment of the ACRC and the definition of what the ACRC does, I am going to skip the first century and take us to the end of the 19th century. In some of these examples there will be a slight preference from the House only because I know them best, but I am sure my Senate colleagues will forgive my parochialism.

The wish to gather and preserve the records of Congress is common for the House and the Senate. There was a long trek to the establishment and work of the ACRC, the body that is charged with advising the House and the Senate on the challenges faced and potential solutions to those challenges.

The Civil War, industrial revolution, Westward Expansion, the Gilded Age, the expansion of the Federal Government, and the extension of Congress' work and its records led to a tacit acknowledgment that the papers of Congress were important records. As I researched, I saw that the House adopted a rule in 1880 that indicated the importance of the records. In fact, it indicated tacitly also that perhaps the House could do better. They passed a rule that all records must be gathered and turned over to the Clerk within 3 days of the end of a Congress. And it also said that if the committees didn't meet their deadline, the Clerk could go in and retrieve everything. That was in response to a challenge of timely archiving, and it seems perhaps there was a frustration somewhere with the committees. Still, a 3-day window does seem a bit harsh, as does threatening the committees with an avenging clerk. So we don't quite know how well that worked.

But 50 years later, the Senate took the lead. Soon after the National Archives building opened, the Senate, in 1937, adopted a resolution that it would store its records at NARA. In 1946, the House did the same. For the public however, the House records were officially closed to all but

the committees that created them and needed access to them. In 1953, the House adopted House Resolution 288, which allowed the records to be opened after they were 50 years old, but only if you wrote the Clerk and asked to see them. You had to ask for a specific record from the Clerk which made it hugely difficult since most researchers didn't know what record to ask for since they hadn't seen it.

That led to another problem in which in-the-know researchers would circumvent the process by going straight to a committee they knew. First, the committee didn't have to ask the Clerk's permission, and second, didn't have to wait for 50 years. So a researcher would go to a committee and ask for the record, the committee would then recall the record back from NARA for its own use, and then share it with the researcher which wasn't the spirit of the law and also led the records to be at risk for wandering off in a more permanent way. That is the 1950s.

In the 1970s, the post-Watergate reforms brought a new interest in transparency and the institution's history. The Senate appointed a historian in 1975 who counseled the Senate's committees on best practices. In 1980, inconsistencies in each Senate committee deciding what its access rules were, were cleared up by the new 1980 20-year rule for how long Senate records would be closed. There are exceptions for different requests that I am sure Karen and Betty could tell you a lot more about, because I can't.

The House also took up the issue of its records. The Committee on House Administration took the lead and issued guidelines on how to handle records. The final major catalyst was a Bicentennial Research Conference in 1989 to regularize how Congress' records were handled and what kind of scholarly and professional advice would keep Congress abreast of current issues, how advocacy could help in the proper care of records, and how that could be formalized. Historians, archivists, people in the Congress, urged the creation of that vehicle. And, shazam, the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress was formed in 1990.

That brings us to what the ACRC does. The public law that created the ACRC states that it shall advise and advocate in order to increase attention to the status and the use of the official records of the House and Senate. Over the past 27 years, the ACRC has been the primary national forum where the concerns of the broadly dispersed congressional studies community are given voice, where thoughtful solutions to these unique challenges to official records are proposed, implemented, and debated. The House and Senate rely on the appointees to the ACRC to ask questions, to sharpen the thinking of the Center for Legislative Archives and the House and Senate officers, to provide advice, to question our assumptions, to offer news, to offer guidance, and to keep us current between the meetings, not just on meeting day.

Every 6 years, in the form of a report like the one currently underway, the ACRC assesses what has happened, how the House and Senate and NARA have performed since the last report, and what are the challenges that we all continue to confront regardless of format of records. The ACRC monitors, guides, and supports the record partners, and addresses the shifting challenges of documenting history of a representative democracy.

Early this month, I looked back over the previous reports to get a sense of specific recommendations that the ACRC has tackled so that as you all prepare to see in the fall a draft of this report, you will know what recommendations have been offered in the past. The First Report focused on the foundation of developing the processes for maintenance of official records of Congress at the Center for Legislative Archives. The Second Report did the same thing. The Third Report turned its attention to the community of congressional archivists, historians, political scientists, suggesting a more collaborative approach to managing and preserving records.

The Fourth Report examined the preservation crisis created by the 2001 anthrax attacks and the effects of eradiating government mail. It also addressed the planning, design, and construction of the Capitol Visitors Center. Several reports at this point started sounding an alarm about electronic records and how the Center would preserve them. Some listed the kinds of electronic records and the amounts of electronic records that were arriving at the Center. And they are adorably small.

Mr. Hunt. You only need one.

Ms. Elliott. You are right. But they sound so big in the current report, and you are thinking, wow, that is a one-word document.

The Fifth Report focused squarely on the electronic records issue, particularly on the Congressional record's instance of NARA's electronic records archives, and the adoption and implementation of a task force to improve online description of the records of Congress.

The Sixth Report is going to document the ACRC's efforts in at least five major areas that we want your continued contributions on in the 115th Congress; they include: the absence of physical space available for textual records stored at the Center for Legislative Archives in the National Archives Building and the creation of additional archival storage space at the Government Publishing Office; expansion of electronic records storage, including offsite redundant storage; transfer and preservation of committee hearing video; social media archiving; the Legislative Enhanced Archival Description (LEAD) project.

As I said a little earlier, in the fall you all will be provided with a draft of the report, and in the meantime we will be looking also for your recommendations on concerns that you see in the future electronic records field and feel that we should continue to get ahead and out in front. If you all have any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them, or you can wait for something exciting in the mailbox.

Ms. Koed. What is the process of creating the report?

Ms. Elliott. Robin and Karen look at what the recommendations of the last report entailed. What are the major issues based on the minutes of the Advisory Committee on the Records of Congress? What have the institutions faced? What have the appointees brought forward as important issues? From that they begin to craft a draft. What did the last report see

was going to be important? Was it important? And what else has cropped up since? And then there's a lot of writing.

Mr. Hunt. And each of us draft particular sections. For some, there is collaboration between the House and Senate archivists, on joint experiences. And then others, one person takes the lead on a draft and shares the draft. All three of us work on it.

Ms. Koed. All right. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. So, Farar, again, the members should expect to see a draft sometime this fall?

Ms. Elliott. Yes, they absolutely should, and even before then. If anyone wants to chew it over more, by all means, give Karen or Robin or Richard a call.

Mr. Ferriero. So I don't know whether in your section on electronic records you are going to cover this, but cybersecurity is a huge thing we should be dealing with.

Ms. Elliott. Yes. Absolutely.

Mr. Ferriero. Okay.

Ms. Elliott. Thank you for the reminder.

Ms. Haas. Other questions or thoughts? Thank you, Farar.
This is our time for new business. Does anybody have any new business that they would like to put up on the agenda?
If there are no additional issues to raise, then at this point, I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

Ms. Adams. So moved.

Mr. Ferriero. Second.

Ms. Haas. All right. Thank you all very much. Appreciate your time.
[Whereupon, at 11:21 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]