

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE RECORDS OF CONGRESS
MEETING # 54
MONDAY, JUNE 18, 2018
THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER
MEETING ROOM NORTH

The meeting began at 10:00 a.m., in CVC Meeting Room North, Capitol Visitor Center, Hon. Karen Haas [Clerk of the House] presiding.

Members of the Committee Present: Karen L. Haas, Chair, Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives; Julie E. Adams, Co-Chair, 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, Associate Professor, Department of History, Critical Diversity in a Digital Age Initiative, Michigan State University; Carol Mandel, Dean, Division of Libraries, New York University; Lori Schwartz, Hagel Archivist, Archives and Special Collections, University of Nebraska; Deborah Skaggs Speth, Former 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; Andrew M. Sherman, Acting Deputy Director and Chief of Staff, GPO; Karen Paul, Archivist, U.S. Senate; Robin Reeder, Archivist, U.S. House of Representatives; Robert Reeves, Deputy Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives; and Kirsten Gullickson, Principal Legislative Analyst, U.S. House of Representatives.

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

First, let me take this opportunity to welcome everyone. Thank you for the continued support of our committee members. Unfortunately, John Lawrence was unable to join us today for the meeting. Hopefully, we will have him at our meeting later this year.

Welcome, and thank you to the Secretary of the Senate, Julie Adams. I enjoy collaborating with Julie, not only with work on this committee, but we also the work we do together on a lot of other projects.

Last, and certainly not least, I would like to acknowledge David Ferriero, the Archivist of the United States. Thank you and your staff for all you continue to do in support of congressional records.

As we come to the end of the 115th Congress, we are preparing for a substantial turnover. We are now managing seven vacant offices and continue to monitor a number of House Members leaving at the end of the Congress. Thus far, there are 71 House Members who have already left, announced they are retiring, or running for another office. Eight of these Members are committee chairmen.

At this time, I would like to turn it over to the Secretary of the Senate and co-chair of our Advisory Committee, Julie Adams.

Ms. Adams. Thank you Karen for hosting today's meeting. And thank you, David and committee members, for your attendance. Even though Deborah Skaggs Speth has retired since we last met -- congratulations and best wishes, Deborah -- fortunately for us, Leader McConnell has asked her to continue to represent him on the committee, and we appreciate your continued interest and contributions Deborah.

I would like to thank the Clerk and her staff for their initiatives in securing the necessary funding for renovations of Building D at the Government Publishing Office to follow up on the funding for the Building A project. This marks an important milestone for the Center for Legislative Archives to have space to continue to preserve and make available the records of Congress well into the future. The incorporation of a state-of-the-art SCIF into Building A gives us, for the first time, the ability to begin to preserve Congress' classified electronic records.

Recently, the Clerk and I had the opportunity to tour both Building A, where the renovation is well underway, and the cavernous Building D, a former train shed, where renovation is still in the planning stage. We certainly needed to use our imaginations to envision what it will eventually look like, and many details remain to be worked out. But we are excited about the possibilities it gives us in meeting the archiving challenges ahead.

I would like to especially thank Richard Hunt, with the Center for Legislative Archives, and Andy Sherman, Acting Deputy Director at GPO, for their updates and willingness to answer our questions and address our concerns.

Thank you also to Robin Reeder for taking the lead in drafting the Sixth Report of the Advisory Committee. I know that Karen Paul has played a key role in that process as well. We look forward to your update on its status and also to receiving the committee members' input in helping us to shape the report's important messages.

It has been a busy 6 months. I look forward to hearing reports from Karen Paul and Betty Koed highlighting some of the major projects underway in the Senate Historical Office, as well as hearing reports from the House Historian and Archivist.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Julie. Now I would like to recognize David Ferriero, Archivist of the United States.

Mr. Ferriero. Good morning. My complete understanding goes out to my colleagues, Karen and Julie, about how busy we all are with what is going on in our government these days; and also to remind folks that that is why we are here, and why the work that we do is so important to make sure that we are documenting this period in our history.

We recently recognized Public Service Recognition Month at the National Archives across the agency. During that time, we host the Archivist's Achievement Awards Ceremony. This year, we honored Donald Collier -- first time that we have honored someone in the Center for Legislative Archives, I believe -- for providing exceptional customer service on loans and

record pickups for congressional customers and stakeholders. So congratulations to Donald. And for those of you who are counting, it doesn't come with any cash prize unfortunately, but it does include our gratitude.

We talked a little bit about civic literacy at the last meeting and I have some exciting news to share with you. Every 4 years, the Presidential Sites Summit takes place. Presidential Sites include the 200 institutions around the country that celebrate and commemorate Presidents in one way or another, including our 14 Presidential libraries. The summit is being hosted by the White House Historical Association this year at the end of August, and we are hosting a session on civic literacy at the National Archives. On the afternoon of August 29th, there will be a panel discussion moderated by Soledad O'Brien, with participation by Lee Rainie of Pew Research, Paul Sparrow of the FDR Library, Tom Walker of the American Village Citizenship Trust, and Louise Dube from iCivics, which is creating gaming kinds of activity addressing civic literacy. I will send out more information about the event, and for those of you who are available, I think it is going to be an interesting panel.

We recently hosted our second annual Congressional Open House for Members of Congress, staff, and families. I think we had 11 Members of Congress participate. It is a crazy time during the summer to try and pull that off, but Karen was there. So any ideas people have to increase the numbers, I would really appreciate it.

The USA 250, the Semiquincentennial Commission, has been established. This is the celebration of the Declaration of Independence in 2026. I am on the Commission. We have not met yet, but I would like to put this on our agenda for next time so we could come up with some ideas that would be sensible for us to recommend as projects that we might undertake as part of the Commission's work. I am thinking about massive digitization kinds of activities. I think increasing access to the records of the government would be one way of celebrating this anniversary.

And, for those of you who are in town on the Fourth of July, you have an invitation to visit the National Archives. We own the Fourth of July! We have the huge ceremony on the steps

on Constitution Avenue before the parade starts with a dramatic reading of the Declaration by reenactors. We have all kinds of activities in-house, and it is the best place in town to watch the parade, which starts just around the corner. Those of you who were at the Caps event know it is be best place in town to watch a parade.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, David. The next order of business is approval of the minutes. Is there objection to dispensing with the reading of the minutes? Hearing none, are there any edits to the minutes? Hearing none, I entertain a motion to approve.

Mr. Ferriero. So moved.

Ms. Haas. Second?

Voice. Second.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. As we are in the process of pulling together the Advisory Committee's Sixth Report, I would like us to take this opportunity to talk a little bit about the future of records. Before we engage in discussion, I have asked Sharon Leon if she would please talk about how she views the future of records, and especially electronic records. Sharon.

Ms. Leon. I will let Robin get us connected, and say thank you to the Clerk for offering me the opportunity to take a look at a couple of projects that I think might offer information about the way that we think about our work going forward.

I was at a wonderful meeting in the spring that was co-hosted by the William & Mary Quarterly and the Early Modern Studies Institute at the Huntington Library at USC. There were many early American history projects that we were talking about and thinking about how scholarship is being changed by using digitized archival sources. That gave me an opportunity to talk about the data work that I am doing and start thinking about how we can

start to put together collections that can be leveraged across many platforms and many interfaces.

I went immediately from that meeting to another meeting called "The Classroom and the Future of the Historical Record." The whole project was funded by an initiative from the Mellon Foundation for large universities to think about the changing environments of online teaching and learning.

The project that my colleagues and I are currently working on is about teaching historical data in the university, and about teaching students to think about electronic records and digitized materials—how to think about them critically, how to think about them in the context of historical thinking skills, and how to make good arguments with digitized materials. Also, how does one interpret the maybe not-so-good arguments that other people are making with them across a variety of types of expression. We are talking about not only textual materials, but also visualizations, mapping projects, quantitative data, and things like that.

What I want to look at today with you are not related to those meetings, but some of the interesting things that have happened since we last spent time together.

First, I want to take us to the notice from the Library of Congress that established, or reestablished, digital labs. You may know that the Library of Congress has been doing development challenges. They have a challenge going on at the moment that invites people from around the country and the world to submit creative, programmatic, and computational uses of the data that is provided by Congress.gov. The winner will be announced Thursday.

The reason I wanted to start with this example is in thinking about our access to, care for, and publication of electronic records, we have to provide materials in a platform and mode of expression that makes them as flexible as possible.

The only thing that makes these kind of challenges possible is to provide data in an open, non-proprietary stream that can be fungible into a variety of applications. That is to say, we know this is all public data, but we also know that there can be ethical implications involved in providing access to any kind of data, especially personal data. We have access control issues with these materials.

Two weeks ago the project called Ancestral Voices at the American Folklife Center at the Library of Congress reviewed the use of traditional knowledge labels in the cataloging of the collection. Ancestral Voices invites First Nations people and Tribal communities to help us understand how to provide ethical access to those kinds of records. The Ancestral Voices project also suggests that we should be thinking about bringing communities together in the ways that we provide access to our data because if we continue in cataloging practices that are only from one perspective, we limit the numbers of ways that we can use those materials.

Earlier in the year, my colleagues at Michigan State, along with other universities, participated in the Endangered Data Week activities. As this would suggest, the Endangered Data Week allows universities, nonprofits, public historians--these types of entities--to come together to determine what can be done as a community to make sure that we are all working together to provide ongoing access to records. All of the projects that come out of Endangered Data Week are granted in open-access and in open-source software work.

Finally, let's take a look at a wonderful project that has been funded by the Institute of Museums and Library Services. The pre-colon title is "Always Already Computational," but the post-colon title is "Collections as Data." It is an effort of archivists and programmers to come together to think about how to treat all collections material as important data that needs to be stewarded and available for use and reuse in many contexts, including historical context, data journalism context, simple science, etc.

There was a Collections as Data event at the Library of Congress. There have been a number of forums such as the "Santa Barbara Statement on Collections as Data," that provide us with

a set of points and principles that I think we would do well to keep in mind as we think about what happens next with our collections. There are 10 statements. One of them is that by thinking about collections as data, it encourages us to develop appliances and computational uses that allow those collections to live, thrive and be reused. It is a matter of stewardship to provide a low barrier to use, ethical principles around access to that data, and to design access to our collections for users. We should provide shared documentation as we think about openness and ethical responsibilities.

If community orientation is always at the forefront of the way that we prepare our electronic collections, then we future-proof our work so that we don't find ourselves in 10 years from now having to reorient all of our systems. I think the guiding principles from the "Santa Barbara Statement" would be a good thing to tack up on the wall as we are trying to prepare for balancing data security, openness and public access, and also when choosing the kinds of systems we commit to. If we think about collections as data and as open access as a key principle, we may save ourselves some mileage in the end, certainly some money, and an awful lot of heartache.

So I am going to encourage everyone, if you have the chance, to take a look at the work from the Endangered Data hackathon--the only thing I can think to call it. They develop good ideas. There are also a number of initiatives going on at the moment that might be worth thinking about for providing access to already-born-digital records. While offices are busily archiving websites, Twitter feeds, etc., I would recommend that we think carefully about the ethical discussions that the "Documenting the Now" project has had when archiving these records.

There is a wonderful new project coming out of Canada called "Archives Unleashed." They have provided a toolkit for computational analysis of crawled websites, of work files, web recording files, all of those types of records. Those folks are guiding our thinking about what the responsible thing to do is as scholars and as data providers.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. Does anybody have any questions or comments for Sharon? Thank you very much, Sharon. You have given us a lot to think about. I would now like to recognize Carol Mandel to talk to us about the future of records with regard to civic literacy. Carol.

Ms. Mandel. Hi there.

So, in a way, a lot of what Sharon said is the future of records in regard to civic literacy and anything else you might want to use them for. Everyone in this room has more expertise in this topic than I do, so I thought that I would pose some questions for you.

I sat down with NYU's university archivist, Janet Bunde, who also has been responsible for the Brademas Papers, to talk about the perspective of how these congressional records, collections that are so scattered and struggling to deal with the big issues that Sharon just discussed, can really help in the civic literacy arena. Is the Presidential Sites forum going to be available as a video?

Mr. Ferriero. Definitely.

Ms. Mandel. The information needs to be out and about everywhere. Janet and I had a discussion to think about how to promote awareness and use. Programs in civic literacy require a kind super-curated packaged teaching materials. You know, you can't tell the public: Oh, just go look at that and learn something about civic literacy. It requires very carefully crafted teaching materials and public programming materials.

We talked about how dispersed geographically and very different the congressional repositories are -- and many of you represent those--and their limited resources and programs. A few are funded for extensive outreach, but others are struggling, especially now with the challenge of ingesting electronic records given the diverse formats when they are received. When you look at the programs and meetings of the congressional records subgroup of the Society of American Archivists, you see the topics that they are dealing

with. Also, because the records tend to be in universities, they are doing things that are educational for faculty on campus versus for the public.

We were trying to imagine -- and I would be curious to know if you have ideas -- what would be some feasible, cost-effective programs that could help these archives have a return on investment? We were imagining --just the way Sharon was just describing the LC challenge using data--grant programs. Challenges tend to be the way you incentivize behavior, but because most of these folks are so short staffed that what they really need are grants that will bring in curators to create these kinds of materials. You may tell me that this has already happened or that Kettering funded it last year.

Ms. Skaggs Speth. Yes.

Ms. Mandel. We were trying to imagine what kinds of joint initiatives--perhaps partnerships with public libraries is the way to reach the public--because repositories in universities are less positioned although they can do some of that programming.

And I am curious about what kinds of programs you can picture with a joint IMLS-NEH initiative that might provide curators for public library programming that comes out of these congressional archives. You could imagine a program for curators and historians, who are often looking for work in their junior years, who could be sent into these archives to create these kinds of projects.

We are really trying to look at what is necessary -- because the need is infinite while the material is not infinite, but it is huge. The kinds of programs out there don't seem to be enough. We were trying to imagine how you could multiply something or make it go further, and make it something that the less well-resourced congressional centers might be able to use.

I was curious about your thoughts of how effective those efforts have been and where there might be more help because it is such an infinite need. And you see these great things from

the better resourced folks, but it is harder to get at these more local collections. So I came with questions instead of answers because you are the experts. I am interested to know how that might be stimulated.

Ms. Haas. Deborah, do you have anything?

Ms. Skaggs Speth. Sheryl might like to talk about the role of the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress (ACSC).

Ms. Vogt. The ACSC has had a partnership with the Kettering Foundation over the last 5 or so years in which a group of representatives of various centers worked with Kettering to learn how to convene and moderate national issues forums. From that, we worked, similar to how Presidential libraries have worked, to create our own national issue guide.

Ms. Mandel. Yes. They are great guides.

Ms. Vogt. One that we created is called "The Divided State of America: how do we get along, how do we work together even when we disagree" which was very timely for what is going on now. It was seen to be something that could be used by any association center member, and we would provide additional workshops for our members to learn how to convene and moderate forums.

This would be something the Center could do and actually draw from their own collections as illustrations for things that are brought out in the issues guide. This was our stepping off point for that. We had some money left over from that project, so we are now offering grants to centers that want to host one of these workshops. If they don't have the expertise on their staff to do this, they can actually hire someone who does do convening and moderating, and bring that person in to do something locally. So far, the Stennis Center at Mississippi State has gotten one of those grants, and they will be holding a forum this fall. We are trying to encourage others to do that as well.

Ms. Mandel. Are they reluctant to apply because they feel like even that takes more resources than they have?

Ms. Vogt. Well, I think that this is a group of people who are really putting in 40-hour weeks already.

Ms. Mandel. Exactly.

Ms. Vogt. Unless they do public programming as part of their functions, it is very difficult for them to step aside and do something like this. We also encourage them to work with other units on their campus -- and some of them have done that -- to bring faculty in. On almost any major campus, I think you will find that there are some faculty scattered around that have had some work doing this kind of deliberation. So that is encouraging.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

Ms. Leon. One other possibility on the grant front, before I left the Center for History and New Media, I wrote what turned out to be a successful grant for the Laura Bush 21st Century Librarians opportunity, which was designed specifically to train and assist public librarians with helping members of their community do local history.

It was set up as a short course offered as an online course designed in four segments, but the materials were open so that if you didn't have the opportunity to take the course in the sequence with everyone else, you could still access the materials. That project is ongoing, and I think that it is not a bad model for thinking about how to reach more people. It is not the typical response to the Laura Bush call.

Ms. Mandel. Right.

Ms. Leon. Most of the responses to the Laura Bush call are about library schools and information schools training rising librarians and archivists. This was really about more professional development in the field.

Ms. Mandel. Did it get taken-up?

Ms. Leon. They are in the process of doing recruiting for the course participants at the moment, so I am a little less clear about how it is going. That is the beauty of writing a grant proposal; the plan could be perfect, but we will see how it goes in the end.

Ms. Skaggs Speth. I would like to mention the McConnell Center and its work with civics education. If you look at this from a State perspective it goes back to educational requirements set up by the State and what they are emphasizing.

Because of a lack of promotion in Kentucky for U.S. history as well as civics education, the McConnell Center undertook its own path to work with social studies teachers within their organization as well as to sponsor what we call teacher scholars, because we have McConnell scholars who are our undergraduate students that are selected for that program. Teachers can apply to be teacher scholars. They are supported by the McConnell Center and attend seminars. They come to the archives. We talk to them about the archives, although the archives weren't open, but they at least got an understanding of what archival materials were. They went through the exhibit. They did things like that together. They traveled here as a group and other places as a group to learn more about our country and our government.

We also employed a civics education coordinator who worked with these teacher scholars and also with the students. Unfortunately because of budget cutbacks, we lost our civics education coordinator. We hope that position will be restored in the future. We have been able to keep up some of the work with our teacher scholars over time, even though we don't have that coordinator. This program was our way to enhance the opportunities for social studies teachers that they weren't getting from a State level.

Ms. Mandel. So it took having that coordinator position?

Ms. Skaggs Speth. Yes, they have continued somewhat but not at the same level as with the coordinator position.

Ms. Mandel. That started it off?

Ms. Skaggs Speth. That started it off, right.

Ms. Koed. It also occurs to me that this gives a great opportunity to form collaborative relationships with public history programs and archival training programs at different colleges and universities. I know, for public history programs for instance, they are often looking for projects for graduate students to work on that are group projects, projects that draw on local resources, and particularly local archival resources and local historical societies. And I know at UC Santa Barbara, where I did my graduate work, they were always looking for really interesting local history projects that their students could work on. I think it would be a terrific collaboration for that.

Ms. Mandel. That is a great idea.

Ms. Haas. Any other comments? Thank you, Carol. At this time, I would like to turn to Deputy Clerk Bob Reeves to talk to us a little bit about the future of the Clerk web redesign and how that fits into this discussion.

Mr. Reeves. Good morning. I am not sure how many of you are aware of the new Clerk website currently called clerkpreview.house.gov. It is public, and it has been for about a year now. The focus of the site, besides having a new, clearer graphical design and the new Clerk logo, is on what is happening in the House today. It has a legislative focus. It is also created with responsive design techniques so it is mobile friendly.

Because we are not in session today, what you see up on the screen is what happened on Friday. It has an integration of the floor summary, includes whatever bills were discussed, which we only had one on Friday, and whatever votes were taken. From our docs.house.gov site, we also pull in what the schedule was for that day for committee meetings.

We are using House Live 2.0. The difference between House Live 2.0 and House Live 1.0 is that it is a high-def feed, and also the player we are using allows you to do a rewind. So if you miss something, you can go back and see it. It is not just a play-forward type of environment.

The other thing we have added is a vote search. Under legislative information, you can scroll down to roll call votes. Prior to creating this, we did a survey of House Members and found that 80 percent of House Members either displayed their votes on their web page or linked to us, and sometimes to the Library of Congress so that you could see the votes. Leadership in both parties displayed it.

We created a vote search. You can see on the left-hand side there is a lot of different criteria that you can search by. One of the things that you don't see there is Member name. So the Member name, we decided, was not an efficient search at the first level. I will show you where we can get to all that information. If you go down under the details of a given vote it shows you all the things about the vote such as the name, passage, and how many yeas and nays. At the bottom, it is a spreadsheet-like display. In this you can sort by different things, such as by State.

We do have different categories that you can use. You can search all parties, or you can search by Republican or Democrat. You can go to a State to see all the Republicans in Louisiana that voted yes. You can sort by everyone who voted yes, or everyone who voted nay. It gives you a lot of different capabilities once you are within the fields to focus on what you are looking for.

Let's go to Member information. Under Member Profiles, another way to find the individual vote is if you click on a given Member. When we click on Mr. Abraham, besides displaying all of the particulars about his office address and committee information, we display the last 100 votes for that Member. There are two different ways you can get at the search criteria. The website is currently in release 3.0. We are calling it alpha because not all of the pages of the current website have been reformatted or redeveloped in the current style.

We have also been going through a lot of behind-the-scenes changes. We have developed a completely new data model which we are using for all of the websites called application program interfaces (APIs). They are programs that allow you to get to the data without having to create files. We are using those to display all of the data that you see on the website itself. Our goal with the APIs is to share internally within the House, also share it within the leg branch, and then eventually release it to the public. That will be the way going forward that we are looking at being able to share information from a transparency perspective.

One of the things that would be of interest to some people in this room, as we expect to be in full beta release by the end of the year, which will mean all the pages have been updated, included in that is a bio guide redesign. So I know that several folks are interested in that. Hopefully, by the start of the new Congress, you will be able to see all these things functioning fully and ready for the new Congress.

I am going to turn it over to Kirsten Gullickson. Kirsten is going to go over another project we have been working on, which is called the Posey Comparative Print Project. Thank you.

Ms. Gullickson. Good morning. Thank you for the introduction. I will just put my slide up here. My name is Kirsten Gullickson, and I have the privilege of working in our Legislative Computer Systems division in the Clerk's Office. I am an IT practitioner. So I often find myself in front of IT folks, and I often have to do a little education.

Our challenge here, not only for the United States House and the United States Senate but across the world, is to prepare, manage, distribute, and archive all of our official records. The official document record -- and this is the sticky point when I am with new IT folks trying to learn our data -- is that we have an official document that is textual. It has wet signatures. The Clerk and the Secretary sign them every day. Our new staff forget that this is the official record. Then we have to manage the digital layer.

I am really excited to be able to talk about our digital layer today because it is going to allow us to provide some exciting tools to our Members of Congress. With the digital layer we will have the ability to see our records on all the devices that we carry. Our Members in both the House and Senate really want to be working this way. We know anecdotally that there are some Members who still like the paper. We know our floor staff still like the paper. But digital is where we are going, and I appreciated all your comments about interoperability and open data use because the data format that I am going to talk about really allows us to do that.

We also know -- I always remind people -- and this is what is foundational to some of the tools that we are building -- yes, we need the scanned version. If that is all we have got, scan it in, put it up, but we also have to put a digital layer under that gives us more than the scanned PDF. And what is that? It is machine-readable formats. The Deputy Clerk and I have been working for years on an XML format that is going to allow us not only to preserve the typesetting, but also have what we need in the XML document; the digital layer to print the paper, but we need to add semantics to it.

Some of you might be interested to hear we are working on a project with GPO and the Office of Federal Register to improve our generation to the XML data format called United States Legislative Markup. We will be able to make some exciting announcements later this summer about it. United States Legislative Markup (USLM) has allowed us to create a new software solution to do comparative prints. It wasn't a project that we necessarily were ready to do, but thankfully we had the XML format underlying the data. When we had a new

House rule implemented and passed in January of last year, we were able to meet the deadline which was December 31, and put a project together.

Basically, what the rule said was two things: In certain places in the legislative process, tell us how the underlying bill changes current law. So that is a really complicated comparison. Take an amendment in a bill and go out and find the current law, which we don't have unified law in Congress, in the Federal Government. We have non-positive law and positive law. There is a great website if you don't understand what that means. It doesn't matter for this presentation. But we have to go find that current law, that section, and we have to take it out of the bill and then do a comparison. We have been able to do that for a few years now. We use a legacy tool to update and meet this provision, and I will show you some outputs, and you will see the output, and it looks very dicey when you look at the output. But our new tool that we built last year was to meet clause 12(b), to take one bill document and compare it with the other bill document. Here in the House we have the House Rules. So our House Rules Committee often does a committee print. And what they usually do is just string a series of bills together, and they might make some technical changes. Members need to see those little words that have been changed between the reported bill and the committee print. And so we were able to take our XML format and get two comparison prints.

The difference between using XML and, say, using Microsoft Word or some other open format is that we can do a match in the front end. So, if section 5 all of a sudden becomes section 10, there is not only the text itself, but there are things in the XML markup in the digital format that allow us to compare section 5 to section 10 so that we are telling the Members: Hey, the word "red" turned "green"; or 5,000 became 5,500; or "shall" became "will," and "will" became "shall." It has been really great to work on this project and provide that tool.

But, again, the short-term work was to meet the December 31 deadline. We were able to do that. Our longer term vision with this tool is to not only add and modernize the comparison between a bill and current law, but also to show how a simple amendment being enacted to

that bill shows the differences, and bring that all into a web file. Hopefully then we can open it up to all the Members and staff here in the House.

Right now, the tool is only being used by our Office of Legislative Counsel so that we can continue to ensure that it is doing comparisons accurately. They are often drafting the two documents that are being compared. So there is a built-in quality assurance check at that time.

This is a sample screenshot of the comparison, and in this example we are doing a character-by-character comparison. And so you will see, when you first start reading it, particularly down here in this section, it takes your eye a little bit to see the comparison because it is character by character. We are going to get a more accurate match though.

The output -- if the House rule calls for this output--we post all the output on docs.house.gov. In docs.House.gov, we are using permanent and durable URLs that help us.

In this example, we have staff in the Rules Committee that have access to upload the documents. Here is one. What we were able to do, because we were able to modernize it, was to add color and typesetting to show the additions and the deletions.

This is being displayed in PDF format. There is HTML in the background. That is the output. Occasionally they will put that HTML up, but right now, they are most comfortable with the PDF since there are Members that we know who do want to print it out.

Again, the format in the background is a United States legislative markup in XML. It is our own standard, but we are incorporating an international standard called the Oasis LegalDocumentML as well as HTML. So we have a lot of international standards that we can use so we can accommodate the particulars that we need for Federal legislation.

Are there any questions?

Mr. Ferriero. Yes, I have one.

Ms. Gullickson. Yes, sir.

Mr. Ferriero. Is the intent to make this available to the public?

Ms. Gullickson. That is my intent.

Mr. Ferriero. Well, as the guy responsible for the Federal Register, I think this would be incredibly useful and important to the American public to see -- to better understand how our government works but also to see government in action.

Mr. Reeves. Do you mean the results, or do you mean the actual tool itself?

Ms. Mandel. I mean the results.

Mr. Reeves. That is now available.

Ms. Gullickson. Yes. These results when they post them are available now.

Mr. Ferriero. Where?

Ms. Gullickson. Docs.house.gov is a public repository.

Mr. Ferriero. But that is not the place where people go to comment on proposed legislation.

Ms. Gullickson. Correct.

Mr. Reeves. Is it also on the Rules Committee website?

Ms. Haas. It is.

Ms. Gullickson. Yes. The Rules Committee occasionally will post it if it comes up during their work. But, yes, your point is very valid. It is very in the weeds in the legislative process. We are trying to build the future phase 2 using APIs. We should be able to then share pieces of the tool with our legislative branch partners, our data partners, and maybe expand the use of the comparison. And, again, with the underlying XML format, it is going to provide us some flexibility to do that. We are working with OFR folks on some of that, and GPO is running a really big project for us. It has been really exciting.

Mr. Ferriero. Great.

Ms. Haas. Thank you.

Ms. Gullickson. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. As Kirsten said, this was a project we weren't expecting. She and her team, led by Bob Reeves, have been doing an excellent job, and we are excited about where it is going. There is still a lot of work, and I think we are trying to take a thoughtful approach in how we do it. I am looking forward to working with all of our legislative partners too.

Before we wrap up this segment of the meeting, I would like to turn it over to Richard Hunt to give us an update on the GPO renovation space and how things are going there. Richard.

Mr. Hunt. Thank you, Karen. I would be happy to.

I would like to note that the effort to create sufficient record storage space for the future growth of House and Senate records began in discussions before this committee in 2014 and that that has resulted in Building A space, which is 50,000 cubic feet of storage, plus the restricted storage area, will be coming online later this year.

Last June, when I reported on the status of Building A, we were at the point where GPO was waiting on submission of bids for the project. And following the June meeting, GPO awarded a contract in August, and preliminary work began in September.

In the current construction highlights from last week's update meeting, we learned that the major effort is now focused on the installation of the heavy machinery for the HVAC systems. If you came by North Capitol Street this weekend, there was a huge crane out there that was lifting that machinery onto the roof, and it is also being installed in all the mechanical rooms for the record storage areas. Last week, the first installment of shelving arrived, and they are beginning to install the shelving in the space as well.

So the schedule for contract completion of Building A is November 3, but the contractor is working diligently to have construction substantially complete by the beginning of September. They also have a target of having one of the stand-alone storage units in the space, about 8,000 cubic feet, ready for us to occupy in September as well, if that is possible.

The certification of the restricted area space by the accrediting agency will take place after we have occupancy of the entire storage area. The move plan when the space is turned over to us is that House and Senate records temporarily stored at the Washington National Records Center, about 4,500 cubic feet, will be moving into Building A. There is an additional 2,500 cubic feet of House and Senate records in borrowed stack space at the downtown Archives building that will move as well. Our target is January of 2019. All new accessions of House and Senate records will be sent directly to Building A.

For Building D, the cavernous space that Julie referenced, that is 100,000-plus cubic feet of storage, the appropriation for that work was secured in the Fiscal Year 2018 Consolidated Appropriations Act in March of this year. The National Archives is in discussions with GPO about the project timeline ahead and wants to move into the design phase as soon as possible. I will have more on that front at the next meeting. There are ongoing negotiations right now.

Ms. Haas. Okay. Any questions or comments for Richard?

Mr. Ferriero. Remind me how many square feet in Building A?

Mr. Hunt. Building A was about 24,000 square feet.

Mr. Ferriero. Thanks.

Ms. Haas. And we are anxious. As Richard knows, we have had ongoing conversations about the readiness by the end of later this year to receive congressional records. So we appreciate all the work that is being done.

At this time, I would like to turn it over to our House historian, Matt Wasniewski, for an update on his projects.

Mr. Wasniewski. Thanks. I am going to use the monitor. Last month, to commemorate Asian Pacific Heritage Month, our office, in cooperation with the Clerk's Office and the Committee on House Administration, published "Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in Congress, 1900 to 2017." It is the final book in a four-book series mandated by the House and the Senate. We have spent 15 years on that series. So we are happy that it is coming to a conclusion.

In scope and structure, the book, which you have at the table, is very much like the earlier books in the series. It chronicles, as we did for Women, African Americans, and Hispanic Americans, their congressional experiences, and that is the focus. Like these other publications, it is also featured in its entirety on our website.

I won't spend a lot of time going through this, but you can click into individual Member profiles. You can then also look at the contextual essays. For the book, there is an introduction and three contextual essays broken down by sections. These are wonderfully illustrated. The Art and Archives Office helped us pull a lot of great images; some from their

collection, some from National Archives, some from the Library of Congress. In addition, we have, as we have with all other exhibitions, if you want to deep-dive into the historical data Congress by Congress, you can access that as well.

So, unlike the other books, though, which were comprehensive updates to earlier editions in this series, this one is the first of its kind. For a number of decades, there were very few historians who studied the careers of Asian Pacific American Members. In fact, at the press conference announcing the creation of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus in 1994, a reporter stood up at the back of the room after the main event and asked a question and said: Well, who was the first Asian Pacific American to serve in Congress, and how many have there been? And it turns out no one knew the answer to that. Norm Mineta, who was the group's first chairman, admitted: We have to write our own history.

This book follows a 120-year narrative that begins with America's 19th century empire in the Pacific, and it continues into the 115th Congress. As you might expect, the story is dynamic and complicated. And at times, it can be troubling; at other times, it can be remarkably inspiring.

There have been a total of 60 Asian Pacific Americans who have served in Congress since 1900, the year that Robert Wilcox, a Delegate from the territory of Hawaii, Hawaii's first Delegate, took the oath of office. Much of the story revolves around, in the early part, those Hawaiian Delegates and Philippine Resident Commissioners as well, all of whom served before World War II.

Like Wilcox, many of them have disappeared from the narrative of American history. Some of their stories are being told here for the first time. Other Members, later Asian Pacific Members, stand out as legislative titans because this book, of course, also covers individuals like Daniel Inouye and Patsy Mink. And perhaps a reaffirmation of that old adage that nothing under the sun is truly ever new, at the heart of this story is Congress' role in American foreign relations and in immigration policy.

Our partners in the Clerk's Office of Communications and the Office of Art and Archives made this book possible, again with design help and also with research on images and Member manuscript collections.

The Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus unveiled the book on May 16. Copies were distributed to Member offices later in that week, and an accompanying e-Book is also available for download from the Government Publishing Office website. So we are very pleased to have this book published.

One other thing I wanted to share with you, and I talked about this to the committee a while back, is an oral history project that we have been working on to commemorate the centennial of the Jeannette Rankin election to Congress and the careers of early women Members. The 115th Congress continued to be a very busy time for us in terms of collecting oral histories. In late 2017, we reached a milestone when we recorded our 300th oral history interview since the program's inception in 2004. A big part of that work the last 2 years has been on this project, where we have been interviewing former women Members of Congress and former women staff who held unique positions and have unique stories to tell about the institution. This project is again, part of the Rankin centennial commemoration.

To date, we have conducted about 40 interviews. They are divided into a couple different categories: Members, staff, and then also children of Members who have unique stories to tell about the institution. These individuals cover the political spectrum, and their service dates go back, in the case of former Members, as far back as the 1960s, and for staff to World War II. So we have a broad range, in terms of years and decades covered. Most of these, again, are available on the website here. Click into the "Representative" section of the site.

We also recently found out that C-SPAN is going to be featuring a number of these interviews in their entirety in the coming months. We expect that, when the project winds down, we are going to have roughly 50 interviews as part of this collection. And, again, our partners in the Clerk's Office have helped make this possible.

One other thing -- and you will be seeing this in the future up on the site. Last week, the Congressional Baseball Game was played, and that is a tradition in our part of the world that goes back to 1909. It has a rich history. We have an exhibition up on the site that talks about the history of the game.

Last week's game was played June 14, which was the 1-year anniversary of last year's attack on the Republican practice on June 14, 2017. About a month after that event, our office started recording oral histories with a number of the principals who were there on the field that day, and others who have a long association with the game, to capture their memories about the events of June 14 and 15, 2017, but also to capture their perspective on what the tradition of the game means to the Hill. The Art and Archives Office has an exhibition that just opened up in the Capitol basement getting at that long tradition and what it means to the Hill community.

To date, we have spoken to roughly 20 individuals. We have a few more interviews to wrap up, and they are going to be in process through the 115th Congress. But we are hoping that by this time next year we will be able to publish an exhibition on the website where we feature, just like the women's page, a congressional baseball oral history page. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thank you, Matt.

Mr. Ferriero. A question, Matt. Do we know if, in the collections that exist around the country of Members' papers, there are oral histories of women in those collections which might be added to this?

Mr. Wasniewski. Yes. The biggest collection that I know of is with the Association of Former Members of Congress, who did an oral history project in the 1970s. For many years it was with the association, and now the complete collection is at the Library of Congress. They interviewed roughly about 125 individuals for the entire project, about 15 of whom are women. They are the best interviews in the whole lot, because the women Members, at that point some of them were recently retired and some of them were still current, because their

perspectives in that snapshot of time in the 1970s was as outsiders on the periphery of the institution looking in -- Patsy Mink, Martha Griffiths, Edna Kelly -- there are some great interviews in that collection. That is the biggest one I know of. Women's paper collections, in terms of Members, I can't think of any off the top of my head.

Ms. Koed. There are a number of former female Senators who have done oral history interviews as part of their collection, and also at Presidential libraries. I will be mentioning our project in a minute here, and we are going to be pulling some of those into our project as well.

Ms. Haas. Great. Thank you.

Mr. Wasniewski. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. That is the perfect segue to the Senate Historian, Betty Koed.

Ms. Koed. Allison is going to help me out. I only have three slides, so she is going to do my slide turning for me. I appreciate that.

I am also really excited about our Women of the Senate Oral History Project. We are making great progress with it. We have completed interviews with nearly all former female Senators at this point, including Nancy Kassebaum, Barbara Mikulski, Carol Moseley Braun, Kay Bailey Hutchison, Blanche Lincoln, Mary Landrieu, and Barbara Boxer. Over this summer, we are going to be adding Olympia Snowe and Hillary Clinton. We are thrilled that we are making really good progress. There aren't that many former female Senators out there, so Matt's team has a lot bigger volume to deal with than we do, but we are trying to get as many people as we can.

I will also mention in response to your question, David, that particularly people like Nancy Kassebaum, for instance, has done oral history interviews in a variety of places. At the recent Association of Centers for the Study of Congress (ACSC) meeting at the Dole Center, I did a

televised interview with Nancy Kassebaum which was really fun. We are going to be pulling on all those resources as part of our larger project.

We have also completed interviews with a lot of longtime female staffers, and it is much too numerous to mention them all, so I am just going to highlight two of them we have done recently.

In April, I interviewed Sheila Burke. She was a longtime Senate staffer who became Chief of Staff to Republican Leader Bob Dole in 1985, and then Secretary of the Senate in 1995. During that interview, which was done on video in the Senate Recording Studio, we had this fascinating conversation about the role of women in the Senate in the 1980s and 1990s. We talked about how Sheila Burke influenced the debate over healthcare in the 1990s and also about how the institution of the Senate has evolved since that time to be more welcoming and more accepting to women in positions of power.

My colleague Kate Scott just completed an interview with Tara DiJulio, who served on the communications staff for five different Senators as well as a committee. She described how technological changes of the past decade, especially Facebook and Twitter, smartphones and those types of technology, completely changed the work of communication shops in Members' offices. When she arrived in the Senate, DiJulio was coordinating with State media via fax machines. Remember those? By the time she left, she was managing social media accounts and holding town hall meetings via Skype. She also told Kate of the challenges she faced as a young woman in an environment where she was typically the only female person in the room.

These interviews are expanding and enhancing our knowledge of the Senate in so many ways, and they will become valuable components and complements to those Members collections. It is a really exciting project.

Then, moving on to the next project, we are also making rapid progress on Volumes XXI and XXII of the Historical Series of the Executive Sessions of the Foreign Relations

Committee. We have been editing these volumes since the 1970s, and we are now up to 1969 and 1970. Working with my colleagues at the Center for Legislative Archives, this project involves bringing the original transcripts here to Senate Security, where we scan them, format them into a Word doc, and then edit and annotate and review them for declassification and publication.

We have completed the initial work on Volume XXI, which covers the important and often really contentious debates in the hearings of 1969, and we have begun the process of declassification on that volume. Volume XXII, which would cover the executive session hearings of 1970, is also moving towards declassification very soon. And we have already started to scan 1971.

This project had been dormant for about 8 or 9 years, largely because we had some difficulties working with the committee for a while, but also we just didn't have the people power in the Historical Office to make it happen. We re-launched the program about 3 years ago, and we have been moving fast on it, so I am delighted.

With Associate Historian Kate Scott in the lead on this project, the Historical Office is developing a new system for review and declassification by external agencies that we hope will make this process more efficient as we go forward. We are also working closely with colleagues at the State Department and elsewhere to keep it moving on a regular schedule. Of course, the 50-year mark is rapidly approaching for these records -- 1969, 1970 -- and so we are hoping that the availability of declassified and published transcripts in print and electronic format will be of value to historians but also will help us to be of value to the Senate, and for Legislative Archives as they start to get requests for these materials.

My last topic I want to talk about today is a personal topic in a way because when I became Senate Historian in 2015, one of the main goals I set for myself was to more fully integrate the work of the historians and the archivists in the Historical Office. Now, the fact that Allison is changing my slide shows I have succeeded in that. We have the highest help at all levels of assistance.

Now, this is not to say we had a problem before; the Senate historians and archivists have always had a good working relationship. But we traveled, more or less, along parallel, separate paths. For years, the historians had relatively little knowledge of what the archivists did, and I have no doubt that the archivists were likewise puzzled about what we historians did. Well, those days are gone. And Karen may be getting sick of seeing me in her office asking questions and asking for help, but we have regular meetings, we have a lot more communication, and we have frequent collaboration. So we are now a fully integrated team, and this has brought us a lot of benefits.

We now have Deputy Archivist Alison White not only changing slides but working with our historical editor, Beth Hahn, to bring a wider array of primary sources, including images of documents provided by the Center for Legislative Archives, to our web page and our daily Twitter feed. Alison and Deputy Archivist Elisabeth Butler are collaborating with our photo historian, Heather Moore, to develop a digital assets management program that will cover all of our digital products in the office.

Another major beneficiary has been our public talks and presentations. Nearly every historical talk we give is now enhanced by an archival component, and certainly every presentation is richer thanks to the participation of our archivists. Probably the best example of this is our annual Constitution Day event. And those are the slides you are seeing up there. Over the past several years, we have seen the participation in this annual event grow exponentially, and I have no doubt that that is due in large part to the collaborative nature of the event.

Our 2017 program, entitled "Out of Necessity: The Senate, the States, and the Great Compromise of 1787," was a two-part presentation that included an introductory historical talk by Assistant Historian Dan Holt, and then it was followed by five guided archival exhibits on the origin, debate, and establishment of the Great Compromise of 1787. Featuring a multitude of primary sources, these five mini-exhibits reflected nearly every aspect of this contentious agreement, from the debates at the Federal Convention in 1787,

through the ratification process, and then to examining the enduring legacy of the Compromise for the Senate. Each exhibit included facsimiles of primary sources, historical volumes, and images with accompanying descriptions and captions.

Exhibit 1 showed the origins of the representation debate in the Continental Congress. The second featured the Virginia Plan and the New Jersey Plan and related material. Exhibit 3 showed the intensity of the debate over the representation question through the lens of James Madison's copious notes. Exhibit 4 featured the public debates during the ratification process through published Federalist and anti-Federalist papers. And exhibit 5 featured the Great Compromise in the Constitution, Articles I and V, showing the legacy of equal representation for the Senate.

Our researcher Mary Bowman worked closely with Senate archivists and our colleagues at the Center for Legislative Archives to identify and reproduce these primary sources to make them touchable for our participants. We filled the large auditorium in the Dirksen Building with more than 200 participants, including Senate staff, public visitors, Senate pages, and local high school students and teachers. Bolstered by the contextual knowledge they gained from Dan Holt's talk, the participants examined the exhibits, discussed the history, and debated the wisdom of the Framers.

It was a total joy to watch. As you can see in the slides, we had students and staff that were interacting with each other. They were picking up the documents and talking about them. And at the end, they got to even eat Constitution cake. So it was not a bad event.

For me, this event and others like it provide undeniable proof of the value of the collaboration between our historians and our archivists. We are already planning for Constitution Day 2018, so if you have any suggestions about new and innovative things to do, let us know.

One thing we are working on is to create a complementary web feature that will take all the information that we gather and all the documents we bring into these exhibits to create a corresponding web feature to our Constitution Day event. And that gives us a permanent place to use this material and continue to reach out to the public.

If you have any questions I am happy to answer them. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thanks, Betty.

I would like to turn now to the House Archivist, Robin Reeder, for an update on her activities.

Ms. Reeder. Thank you, Karen. To begin with, here are some statistics since our last meeting in December: We have had 24 consultations with Members; we have transferred 311,250 pages of textual records; we have loaned 133,550 pages of loans to committees; and requests for empty cartons have been 17.75 cartons.

Since December, we also have had a reorganization in the Office of Art and Archives. Some of our staff's job titles and responsibilities have changed. Heather Bourk is now our Associate Archivist. This change is a reflection of Heather's leadership role. As the point person on electronic records, Heather continues to appraise and verify electronic records and facilitates their transfer to the National Archives.

Alison Trulock is now our Outreach Archivist. This change is part of the House's increased efforts in providing assistance to committees. She continues her work on the *Records Search* database on the House's History, Art & Archives website. Since the December meeting, 19 new documents have been added. Alison also coordinated the transfer of the 113th Congress records to the National Archives. There were approximately 1,275,000 pages of records for the 113th Congress and 187,500 pages from previous Congresses sent to the National Archives. Alison also recently completed the *Digital Curation for Information Professionals* certification program through the University of Maryland and, as her capstone project, wrote an electronic records policy for the archives department.

The Curator's Office has been busy developing several exhibitions. Just last month, the office unveiled an exhibit on the history and traditions of the more-than-century-old Congressional Baseball Game. Matt Wasniewski mentioned it is located in the basement of the Capitol and

includes congressional baseball objects from the House collection from 1926 to 2006, including programs, baseball cards, tickets, medals, hats, baseballs, photographs, letters, and a trophy.

And, finally, we have been working to compile the Advisory Committee's Sixth Report, and I will be speaking about these details in a little bit. Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Thanks, Robin. I would like to recognize Karen Paul now, the Senate Archivist, for her comments.

Ms. Paul. We assisted the two Members' offices that closed earlier this year and are pleased to report that both Senators selected an archival repository to receive their collections. I am working with the three offices of Members retiring at the end of this year and, as part of that, revised and updated our "Preserving Senate History: Closing a Senator's Office" handbook to include a new form to document file fixity, document types, and operating systems.

Support for Members' records preservation was the focus of Leader McConnell's statement for the Congressional Record recognizing *Congress Week* in April. He called attention to the Association of Centers for the Study of Congress' work to commemorate the anniversary of Congress' first quorum through commemorative events designed to encourage students to explore the work of Congress and its constitutional role in our government.

He noted that "thanks to the work of the ACSC and its member organizations, the number and research value of congressional collections being preserved nationwide has improved substantially, producing an educational resource for legislative branch studies that is really beginning to rival the Presidential library system."

I have to say as an aside that since my involvement with archiving in the Senate, beginning in 1982, that 95 to 96 percent of all Members who have retired have, in fact, donated their collections to a research repository. That is a marked contrast to the preceding decades.

From December through May, we transferred 244 accessions of textual records, totaling 496 cubic feet from 20 committees, and 1.89 terabytes totaling 122 accessions from 20 committees and offices.

The Joint Select Committee on Solvency of Multiemployer Pension Plans was established in February. We are working closely with committee staff to communicate Senate archiving requirements and establish record-keeping procedures that will facilitate the preservation of the committee's textual and electronic records when it ceases business at the end of the year.

Deputy Archivist for Digital Archives Alison White is working with the Foreign Relations Committee to ensure that a new document management system developed by the committee can export records in a way that will enable proper archiving of the records and all associated metadata.

In 2017, it was discovered that approximately 336 cubic feet of Judiciary and other committee records had been incorporated into a Senator's collection at a university, so we are now working with the university archivist and the Center for Legislative Archives to have those records returned. Earlier this year, some committee files were discovered in the papers of a former committee counsel and former aide to a Senator, and these were returned from a State-based repository. Special thanks to the staff at the Center for Legislative Archives for their assistance with the return process in both of these cases. We really appreciate that extra help.

So someone who helps us so much with committees is the Center for Legislative Archives courier, Donald Collier. The staff of the Senate Historical Office extends our very best wishes to you Donald, upon receiving the Archivist Achievement Award for this year. This was well-earned and well-deserved. Congratulations.

In 2017, I drafted a script for an online briefing entitled "Introduction to Senate Archives: What Staff Need to Know." Further work on this was postponed pending final approval and issuance of the revised "Records Management Handbook" for United States

Senate committees, which occurred in December, so work on this online training has resumed. Besides delivering copies of the handbook to committee chairs, ranking chairs, and staff directors, we determined that the most effective way to do a rollout was to meet with every committee chief clerk, archivist, and systems admin to review the updated contents and pose a series of survey questions designed to help us gauge the status of electronic records preservation for each committee.

This was very helpful strategically in that it encouraged a few committees to catch up with their electronic records and email archiving while providing us with the kind of information we needed to improve our recordkeeping guidance. The discovery of increased use of specialized legislative tracking, document management, collaboration, communication, and other tools caused us to create new guidance, titled "Records Management for Special Applications."

We continue to process a major accessions of video recordings of the Republican Conference. Deputy Archivist White is working with the Sergeant at Arms' Printing, Graphics, and Direct Mail group on the conversion of over 700 VHS and Beta tapes. We have about another 100 to 150 tapes to appraise for conversion, but the bulk of the remaining work on this project is the creation of descriptive log sheets for about 150 tapes that had no original content logs. These materials date from the mid-1980s to the early- 2000s. We are continuing to accession master committee hearing videos from the Senate recording studio, most recently doing the 112th Congress.

We also continue to provide guidance on the preservation of social media. Committees are asked to archive their social media at the end of each Congress, while Members' offices tend to do a one-time download upon retirement, although some are doing it on a more routine basis. Because the process of downloading webarchive format files is time-consuming and rarely without glitches, Deputy Archivist White is working with the vendor most frequently selected to offer a streamlined process for offices who wish to take advantage of it.

In 2018, the Senate Historical Office embarked on a project to preserve, manage, and digitize the Senate Historical Office's large photo collection. Senate Photo Historian Heather Moore defined the project's needs and requirements. It was then decided to use this opportunity to incorporate all current and future digital assets of the Office, including photographs, digitized audio and video, oral histories, presentations, and electronic publications. Working with the Secretary of the Senate web staff, Deputy Archivist White and Photo Historian Moore are delineating potential use cases, creating decision criteria, and will evaluate and rank systems that meet those criteria.

So now to some exciting news. The Advisory Committee has been studying how best to extract, preserve, and provide access to records maintained in constituent service systems since June of 2013. At that time, a special House task force met with the database vendors, who proposed a Microsoft Access database to make the data useful to repositories outside of the proprietary software structure. The Access database solution, however, did not scale up to accommodate Senate collections.

Then, switch to congressional archivists in the Society of American Archivists' Congressional Papers Section. This group continued to explore solutions. In 2017, the task force issued a white paper that discussed the ongoing development and use of these databases as well as the obstacles facing collecting repositories. It also pointed to the growth in research based on the aggregation of such data and made recommendations that emphasized the need for a coalition of interested stakeholders to develop a technological solution for processing, preserving, and providing access to constituent data that will benefit both large and small repositories.

Then, fast-forward to January 2018. The ACSC Executive Committee formed a task force on constituent services data, building on the 2017 white paper. The task force is investigating the feasibility of developing and hosting a tool that can process and provide access to this data. It is contacting a number of holding institutions and using the responses to create user profiles.

The task force also is studying organizational models for open-source tool development and governance and identifying scholars who have used constituent correspondence or have expressed an interest in the data to better understand researcher needs and to support a future grant application.

Finally, the task force, under the leadership of West Virginia University libraries, has just been awarded a LYRISIS Catalyst Fund Grant to hire a consultant to conduct a feasibility study and to plan for the collaborative technical infrastructure for the open-source congressional correspondence data access tool currently underway in development at West Virginia University. This is really exciting news that this granting agency has provided the money to move forward with this project.

I wanted finally to mention the ACSC annual meeting. The ACSC, I think as most of you know, has been the foremost organization bringing together those who create the records of Congress, those who select and preserve them, and those who use them for scholarly research and educational purposes.

In April, as Betty mentioned she attended, and Alison and I also attended, the annual meeting that was held at the Robert J. Dole Institute of Politics. The meeting theme was "New Frontiers of Engagement." These annual meetings are important sources of information for us about what research is being undertaken and what archival sources are relevant to that research, thus informing our own records retention and preservation decisions.

This particular meeting also demonstrated how congressional collections are being used for museum exhibit and civics educational purposes, thus really broadening our appreciation of the value of Members' records that we can then share, and are sharing with our Senate community.

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

Mr. Hunt. Thank you, Karen.

I want to offer a few observations about some of the major functions at the Center.

On the accessioning front, looking at the numbers over the last 30 years, the trendline for textual records accessioning remained steady in the 1990s and the first decade of the 2000s, with an annual average rate of 3,500 cubic feet per year. In the last 8 to 10 years, that rate has declined slightly but not precipitously, so that it is now running at about 3,000 cubic feet per year.

On the electronic records front, the volume of electronic records has increased significantly since we first began receiving regular transfers of electronic records in 2007 and 2008. From our midyear report, you can see we are now at 188 terabytes of data. In a cursory examination of that data, a large proportion of those electronic records are unique and discrete information sets that were never captured on paper, or rarely captured on paper, including the big volume items of hearing videos now in digital form, audio recordings in digital form, and the vast web archives that we have collected. So our rough estimates say those three types of digital content are about 50 percent of the total holdings that we have. A recent transfer of one congressional investigative committee that completed its task showed that modern committees are still generating a lot of paper. We got lots of electronic data, but we got a lot of boxes of records too. So traditional record-keeping practices continue currently in the House and the Senate.

On the reference front, I will relay two recent testimonials we heard from some of our research community that underscore the value of the National Archives, the importance of the records we hold at the Center, and the high level of service provided by our staff.

One was from a patron doing genealogical research on his Revolutionary War ancestor. He learned, in the course of his research, that the pension file had been transferred at some point to the House Committee on Pensions, much later than when his ancestor was alive. So he wrote to me directly after receiving help from the Center and told this story.

He said he learned for the first time that House committee records were stored at the Center for Legislative Archives. That is not surprising. Everyone needs a similar epiphany at some point in time. When he discovered that, he sent us quote, a “Hail Mary” email, really not expecting much chance of success. "My email was sent on a Saturday, and literally 72 hours later I received not a generic form letter but PDF copies of my ancestor's pension file, including two Revolutionary War discharges and a page from the family bible."

Ms. Haas. Wow.

Mr. Hunt. Yes. He noted that these materials were not in the original pension file he had previously located and, quote, "are not available anywhere else, because the local county courthouse burned in 1869 and they lost over a century's worth of records. I wanted for you to be aware of the outstanding customer service I received from your staff."

And then, secondly, a professional researcher wrote to one of our reference archivists that in, quote, "research across the globe, I can count on one hand the number of archivists or staff that are as friendly and helpful as you have been. Your work is vital to those of us who research and write. I truly appreciate the work you and the staff at NARA perform. It is crucial to quality research."

I highlight these two examples, but I want you to know that this same type of service is delivered to customers every day at the Center and at the National Archives, and now you can appreciate what it means to the end user. And it means a lot to us.

I would also just mention that, starting this summer, we will begin work on the Web Harvest for the current Congress, the 115th Congress. There will be a lot of work devoted to providing the seed list to Internet Archive to begin capturing websites in the fall and into the early winter.

And then, finally, I just wanted to note and you saw in the midyear report there is a new e-Book that we have made available on our website, "America and the World: Foreign Affairs

in Political Cartoons." It features 63 political cartoons by Clifford Berryman on foreign policy issues from the Spanish-American War to the start of World War II.

This product came as a request from teachers saying that these were difficult subjects for them to convey to their middle school students, in particular, and even high school students. They wanted a visual approach and something that they could use more as a game and a puzzle to present these subjects to their students. We have seen them in action, and they seem to be very successful. It makes it a little more fun and engaging for the students handling these materials.

And notice that Charlie Flanagan, our educational leader, is not here because he is in West Virginia doing a series of workshops with the Robert C. Byrd Center and the West Virginia Humanities Council. Next week he is in Dallas, Texas, presenting workshops at the Humanities Texas teacher workshop at Southern Methodist University. And in July he will be here in D.C. at the Gilder Lehrman Summer Institute hosted by George Washington University, and then in Chicago at the University of Chicago for the Graham School Summer Institute. Then in the summer and the fall, he is conducting six workshops for school districts in the Florida Panhandle.

And Carol, these workshops are where our local connection is being made, working with the social studies coordinators there to develop new materials to meet their needs or customize some of those that we have already created. That has been very successful. So that was a great suggestion. And that is all I have.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. And, Richard, thanks again for all that your team does for us and for the help in preparing for this meeting. I really appreciate it.

Mr. Hunt. You are welcome.

Ms. Haas. Our next item is an update on the draft of the Sixth Report of the Advisory Committee, and I will turn it over to Robin Reeder.

Ms. Reeder. Thank you. We have been working on updates to the Advisory Committee's Sixth Report since the last meeting in December. We received some edits from some of the Advisory Committee members, the Senate, and the National Archives that we are working on incorporating into the report.

The Office of Communications in the Clerk's Office will be copy editing and designing the report, and a final draft will be circulated to the committee members by the end of July. This will be the final opportunity for review prior to publication. Published copies of the final report will be available at the next Advisory Committee meeting in December.

Thank you.

Ms. Haas. Okay. Any questions for Robin? At this time, I will open it up to any new business.

Ms. Koed. Can I just say one thing about looking forward? All of us today have touched on the issue of State and local resources, civic literacy, and the need to reach out to these local communities as Richard said in Florida, and elsewhere. That might be something that we as a group could think about for the next meeting, not only what we are doing in our individual offices, but a way to collaborate more efficiently to bring the resources we have to a broader audience.

In the Historical Office, we do a lot for State-based programs. We work a lot with Members' offices who are working on State-based projects, and we have our States in the Senate project online. But I think that to open up the discussion throughout the next 6 months with all the members of this committee might be useful as we go forward, to come up with ways that we can do that better and reach out more often.

Ms. Haas. It sounds like the interest is definitely here for that, Betty. Thank you. Anything else? Sheryl?

Ms. Vogt. I would like to bring up again something I mentioned at the end of the last meeting, and that is the continued use of Archivists' Toolkit for the work that we are doing. This is something we have had to take into consideration in our own institution. As I mentioned, Archivists' Toolkit is no longer supported by its company. Because of this our staff has said that -- we are using EAD, which is Encoded Archival Description and Archives Toolkit uses this. That is the primary reason that our staff wants to change to ArchivesSpace. In making this transition, which will take about 3 years, our staff will be investigating the probability of how well these records will accurately ingest into ArchivesSpace.

There is something now called the Harvard ArchivesSpace Ingest Checker, and so we have had about 20 finding aids that we have put through that so far. Most of the errors we have found have been formatting of dates, how attributes are used, and the numbering of container fields, but these can be fixed in an automated fashion. We do know that some errors we may find, our staff will have to go back and do that manually, which will be very time-consuming. So I am just trying to make the point that there are a lot of factors that have to be considered in making this transition. I think, if we could start looking into that now, seeing what it is going to be a concern for the House, the Senate, and the Center that would be a good thing because we can't get behind on this front. We have made too much progress to get behind. And it is really good that Carol is on the ArchivesSpace board, are you not?

Ms. Mandel. Yes. I just stepped down from my role as founding chair -- I have been chair for about 5 years -- because I will be retiring at the end of the month. But, we spent a lot of our time on making sure there were services provided for migration. When the Mellon Foundation asked us to create a tool that would be more widely used, we actually created a budget for migration that we ended up needing from the grant proposal.

I don't know how much you have consulted with LYRISIS, which is the home of ArchivesSpace. I am sure your staff has talked to ArchivesSpace staff. In addition to hiring LYRISIS to support migration, they can also provide advice, as can ArchivesSpace staff, and other member of the ArchivesSpace community. We built this into the program, because it was a new tool and the whole point was to move people from Archivists' Toolkit to

ArchivesSpace. I want to make sure you are taking advantage, first off, of all the ArchivesSpace community resources that are out there. Probably your folks do know. But it is not out of the question that grant funding of some kind might be available, because the Mellon Foundation was very invested in making sure that this tool is widely used. I don't know if you have explored that.

Ms. Vogt. I am not sure, because there is a working committee for that, and I am not that tech-savvy to know exactly what they have done. But we have some really richly detailed finding aids online.

Ms. Mandel. I am sure.

Ms. Vogt. This is one of our main concerns. We have really enhanced description that we don't want to lose when we make the transition. We are beginning the process, and we have a lot to learn, and I just want to give some forewarning on that.

Ms. Haas. Thank you. Any other comments? Okay. If not, I would entertain a motion to adjourn.

Mr. Ferriero. So moved.

Ms. Haas. Okay. Thank you all. Appreciate the time.

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