OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, JULY 27, 2006

Printed for the use of the
Committee on House Administration

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

32–720 WASHINGTON : 2007

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION

VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan, *Chairman*

BOB NEY, Ohio
JOHN L. MICA, Florida
JOHN T. DOOLITTLE, California
THOMAS M. REYNOLDS, New York
CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan

JUANITA MILLENDER-McDONALD, California
Ranking Minority Member
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania
ZOE LOFGREN, California

PROFESSIONAL STAFF

WILL PLASTER, *Staff Director*
GEORGE F. SHEVLIN, *Minority Staff Director*

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

THURSDAY, JULY 27, 2006

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:15 a.m., in room 1310, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Vernon J. Ehlers (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Ehlers, Ney, Doolittle, Millender-McDonald, and Lofgren.

Staff Present: Fred Hay, General Counsel; Bryan T. Dorsey, Professional Staff Member; Peter Sloan, Clerk; Craley Funfgeld, Staff Assistant; George F. Shevlin, Minority Staff Director; Michael Harrison, Minority Professional Staff Member; Matt Pinkus, Minority Professional Staff Member; and Kristin McCowan, Minority Staff Assistant.

The CHAIRMAN. The purpose of today's oversight hearing is to get an update on the operations of the Library of Congress and the ways in which the Library is preparing for its future through its ongoing strategic planning, technology, design and preservation initiatives.

One of the greatest challenges for America's librarians and archivists is responding to the changing ways in which information is being created, shared, stored and maintained in the digital age. In order for our Nation's libraries to maintain their relevancy to the public, they must look for opportunities to not only adapt to the digital revolution, but to embrace it. Dr. James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and one of our witnesses today, is committed to leveraging the advances in technology to enhance the Library's operations and to meet the evolving needs of the Congress and the public.

Today, he will lay out his vision for how the Library of Congress will continue to transform itself in order to continue their goal of being America's premier library into the 21st century.

One of the largest and most exciting additions to the Library is the creation of the National Audiovisual Conservation Center, the NAVCC, located in Culpeper, Virginia. This facility, which was made possible through a partnership between the Library and the Packard Humanities Institute, with the aid of the Architect of the Capitol, will eventually house the entirety of the Library's audiovisual collection and will feature specialized preservation laboratories used to minimize the degradation of these items over time.

I look forward to receiving an update from our witnesses on the construction of the NAVCC facilities so that we may better understand how the opening of this facility next year will impact current library operations.

An exciting initiative that embraces emerging technologies is the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program, or NDIIPP. I think you need better acronyms; this has all kinds of connotations. Its goal is to develop ways to preserve information through the use of technology.

Now halfway through its congressional authorization, NDIIPP is committed to increasing access to a rich body of digital content through the establishment of a national network of committed partners who have a common goal of preserving our digital heritage.

The network now has over 67 partners and plans to expand the program to assist state governments. NDIIPP is focused on the retention of digital media which is so often lost due to its evolving and dynamic nature, and I can vouch from experience, having dealt with this at the state level with county and city clerks who wanted to preserve all the records digitally, and few of them understood the complications of maintenance. And I was fortunate to be in a position there to write the legislation to help guide them in that, but they will certainly need your guidance.

To help guide the NDIIPP, a National Digital Strategy Advisory Board has been created. It is comprised of Federal agencies such as the National Archives and Records Administration, NARA; the Government Printing Office, GPO; and the National Science Foundation, NSF; in addition to business leaders and technical experts.

We would like to learn from our witnesses today what progress has been made since the establishment of the program, which upcoming projects are included in the program and the overall strategic direction. I believe that the work of this program will be instrumental in the establishment of government-wide standards for the preservation, authentication and access to digital information. I encourage the Library to assist GPO and NARA as they work on standards that not only will digitize Federal Government information but will also preserve it and make it available to the public.

Another technology initiative that is of interest to the committee is the World Digital Library, which will create a repository of rare and historic materials for public use. This program is being supported through both private and public funding. Recently, Google Incorporated expressed their support for the project through a $3 million donation.

While I am pleased with the progress that has been made in preserving our history through the use of technology, there are many questions raised by the formation of the World Digital Library. With the explosive growth of the Internet and the never-ending amount of material available that could potentially be archived, the Library must ensure that the proper controls are in place so that the proper information is being stored with the appropriate operations in place to maintain the integrity of the collection.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today concerning the management and governance of this important project.

Another issue of importance before this committee is the progress being made on the Jefferson Building redesign. With the construc-

tion of the Capitol Visitor's Center growing closer to completion, there will soon be an opportunity to give visitors to the CVC an additional rich multimedia experience as they enter the Jefferson Building. I am eager to get a sense of our plans and schedule for the Jefferson Building space.

Before I conclude my remarks, I should note another issue that has come to my attention. Over the past year, the committee has received several letters from Members expressing deep concern with CRS experts' ability to meet the standards of the agency's mission by providing the Congress with, quote, nonpartisan objective analysis and research on all legislative issues, end quote. When comments and criticisms are being made in the media, it should be the objective of CRS to always present to the Congress confidential analyses that fairly represents all sides of an issue. This committee would like CRS employees to keep that in mind when speaking about their work for the Congress outside of the office.

Finally, all of the changes that have taken place within the Library over the past several years and the increasing focus on digital and technological enhancements to the Library's operations, I would like to get a sense from Dr. Billington as to what is being done to ensure that the workforce in place at the Library of Congress is equipped and prepared for this change. As we prepare our physical and technical infrastructure with the equipment required to keep up with the latest technology, it is equally important to ensure that our workforce is prepared for this transition.

At this time, I would like to recognize Ms. Millender-McDonald, who is not yet here, and I would like to ask if some other member of the minority would like—Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. I will just say, I think this is an important hearing. The Intellectual Properties Subcommittee, on which I also serve, is in the middle of a markup, so I may have to leave before we are concluded. It is not for lack of interest in this subject.

I am particularly interested in the digital efforts of the Library, and one of the things I hope that can be addressed in the testimony is the issue of accessibility of the digital effort. As I am sure the librarian is aware, there is an effort underway in the private sector now to develop open-source standards so that no proprietary standard would prevent access to the information. And I am very interested in pursuing that because, to the extent that this is America, really the world's library, the world needs to have access to it, and there shouldn't be any barrier that is proprietary to that goal.

Secondarily, I am interested—I didn't see any reference to it in the written testimony, but I assume that it has been thought of—which is cyber security, which needs to be built in at the very beginning to the digital effort of the Library. And I am interested in what process we are using to make sure that the cyber security element has been addressed from the get-go on this.

I commend—I understand that copyrights do provide some barriers to access, but I also know that it is possible to overcome those barriers with the permission of copyright holders. And in fact, we are well underway in adopting an orphan works bill that I think will assist this greatly because most of the protected materials are no longer being commercially exploited, and we are going to come

up with a way to make sure that that material is made available to the culture and not simply lost because of copyright rules.

I just think this is a very exciting project. Google is not actually in my congressional district; it is about 8 miles outside, but I certainly have many, many constituents who work for Google, and I am glad they have been generous in contributing, and I am hoping that that will be matched by other companies in the digital space who understand the implications for not only the United States but the world in making this information so freely available.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman, and also to the Library for this important work, and I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. And if you do have to leave for a different hearing, you will be gone for a long discussion on intellectual properties.

Mr. Doolittle, do you have any——

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I have no comments.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, any members wishing to submit an opening statement for the record may do so, and it will be entered into the record.

STATEMENTS OF JAMES H. BILLINGTON, LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS; DEANNA MARCUM, ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN FOR LIBRARY SERVICES; LAURA CAMPBELL, ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN FOR STRATEGIC INITIATIVES; AND JO ANN JENKINS, CHIEF OF STAFF, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

The CHAIRMAN. I would like to welcome our first panel of the day and ask you to take your places at the table. We are pleased to welcome you.

We have with us Dr. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, who is undoubtedly somewhat jetlagged from a recent trip to Russia. We also have Deanna Marcum, Associate Librarian for Library Services; Laura Campbell, Associate Librarian for Strategic Initiatives—almost sounds like a Pentagon job; and Jo Ann Jenkins, Chief of Staff to the Library of Congress.

Welcome all, and please address the committee in any way you see fit at any time.

I would first like to turn to Dr. Billington for his testimony.

STATEMENT OF JAMES H. BILLINGTON

Dr. BILLINGTON. Thank you, Chairman Ehlers, and members of the committee.

It is a real pleasure and honor to appear before this committee and to thank you for the strong support and wise counsel that the committee has given to the Library of Congress over so many years.

I appreciate the opportunity to highlight for you some of the developments and initiatives that are already transforming the Library of Congress and have already begun to shape Congress's Library in the 21st century, as you have already enumerated.

The Congress of the United States, Mr. Chairman, has been the greatest single patron of a library in the history of the world. Building on its purchase of Thomas Jefferson's large, wide-ranging, almost unique personal library, the Congress has created and sustained what has now become the largest and most widely inclusive

repository both of the world's knowledge in almost all languages and of America's creativity in almost every kind of format.

The overwhelming challenge now facing the Library in its third century—the oldest Federal cultural institution—is how to sort and preserve the exploding world of digital knowledge and information, and then how to integrate it into the still-expanding world of books and other traditional analog materials so that we can continue to provide Congress and the American people with the objective knowledge and the dependable information that is needed more than ever in this information age. Everything from our security to our economic competitiveness increasingly depends on the information and knowledge base of our country.

There is no change in the Library's basic, historic mission of acquiring, preserving and making accessible the world's knowledge and the Nation's creativity. But the way in which we do our work is changing radically in the face of the greatest revolution in the generation and communication of knowledge since the advent of the printing press—the digital age. The Library began the necessary process of transformation more than a decade ago with our American Memory Web site, which provides free access on the Internet to the Library's primary documents of American history for use by the Nation's schools and everyone else in their own locality who has access to our Web sites. At the same time, this committee asked the Library to create THOMAS, giving the public a new, simple way to access legislative information online.

Since then, more than a decade ago, each area of the Library has pushed forward with utilizing technology to increase both its internal efficiency and its external outreach.

In my longer statement that is in the record, I touch upon how electronic technology is transforming the work of CRS, the Copyright Office, the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, the Global Legal Information Network and the Library's digital resources for K-through-12 teachers and local users across the Nation.

By now, the Library is doing far more work with far fewer people, 1,091 fewer FTEs than in 1992. Last year, we acquired more than 2 million new analog items, gave special conservation treatment to 1.4 million of the 132 million analog items in our collections, and received nearly 3.7 billion electronic transactions on our Web site. We expect a 21 percent increase this year, to nearly 4.7 billion hits.

Without our worldwide comprehensive acquisitions policy, America might never have possessed the previously little known autobiography of Osama bin Laden or the materials needed to reconstruct the traditional laws of Afghanistan that were almost entirely destroyed by the Taliban, just to site two examples.

Today, we want to report to you on the three major new library undertakings which you have already itemized for us, Mr. Chairman, and each of these was launched in response to congressional initiatives.

First is the Library's emerging new Audiovisual Conservation Center in Culpeper, Virginia; our National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program, terrible acronym though it may be; and finally, the new enhancements we are adding to the

Jefferson Building for the greatly increased number of visitors expected in 2007.

The Culpeper facility was authorized by PL 105–44 and has been supported by $53 million in Federal appropriations over the last 4 years. We are deeply grateful to the Congress for this funding.

The facility has been built and funded by the Packard Humanities Institute at a projected of cost of more than $150 million, which will be the largest private gift in the history of the Library and one of the largest such capital gifts ever conveyed to the Federal Government.

Dr. Deanna Marcum, our Associate Librarian for Library Services, will discuss this unprecedented project for preserving our massive but often deteriorating audiovisual heritage, which contains so much of 20th century America, its history and creativity.

Dr. Marcum will be followed by Laura Campbell, our Associate Librarian for Strategic Initiatives, who will report at midpoint on the National Digital Information Infrastructure Preservation Program, which she has directed since its establishment in December of 2000 by a special Congressional appropriation supporting PL 106–554.

Finally, our Chief of Staff, Jo Ann Jenkins, will describe the project she is directing to enhance the experience that the greatly increased number of visitors will have at the new Capitol Visitor Center and connecting passageway to the Thomas Jefferson Building opening next year.

We are grateful to members of this committee for their longstanding support, both for restoring so magnificently the Jefferson Building and for now reconnecting it physically and intellectually with the Capitol, where the Library was originally housed for most of the 19th century.

The new program in the Jefferson Building will focus on bringing knowledge into life for an altogether new audience of visitors. It will complement the exhibits in the Capitol Visitors Center by celebrating something that is not as well known as it should be, namely, the Congress's unique historic role in preserving the creativity of the American people within the legislative branch of government—largely by locating the Copyright Office within the Library and making it possible for its deposits to be systematically housed there, as well as the growing number of deposits from American creative figures over the years.

These three outstanding leaders to my left who will now continue the testimony exemplify, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the quality of our remarkable and dedicated library staff. Like our unique collections, this staff is a national treasure.

We will begin with Dr. Marcum, who will discuss our mission for transforming Library Sciences with examples of work already underway, and especially the National Audiovisual Conservation Center.

[The statement of Dr. Billington follows:]

Statement of Dr. James H. Billington
The Librarian of Congress
before the
Committee on House Administration
U.S. House of Representatives
July 27, 2006

Chairman Ehlers, Ms. Millender-McDonald and members of the Committee:

It is a pleasure and honor to appear before this committee and to thank you for the strong support and wise counsel you have given the Library of Congress over so many years. I appreciate the opportunity to highlight for you some of the exciting developments, initiatives and challenges that are transforming the Library of Congress, and sketch out the emerging road map for Congress' Library in the 21st century.

The Library of the 21st Century

The Congress of the United States has been the greatest patron of a library in the history of the world. Building on its purchase of Thomas Jefferson's large and wide-ranging personal library, the Congress has created and sustained what is now the world's largest repository of recorded knowledge, in the widest variety of languages and formats, and the most exhaustive record anywhere of the rich and diverse creativity of the American people.

The overwhelming challenge facing the Library in its third century is how to superimpose the exploding world of digital knowledge and information onto the still expanding world of books and other traditional analog materials. How can we preserve and seamlessly integrate these two worlds so that we can continue to provide Congress and the American people the objective and dependable information and knowledge that is needed more than ever in this information age?

There is no change in the Library's basic mission of acquiring, preserving and making accessible the world's knowledge and the nation's creativity. But the way in which everything is done is changing -- and has to change -- in the face of the greatest revolution in the generation and communication of knowledge since the advent of the printing press.

The Congress charged us in 2000 to develop a National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP). Through NDIIPP, the Library is building a national network of diverse partnerships to collect, save and provide access to a body of high quality educational content in digital form. We have been working closely with content providers, technology innovators, libraries, archives, and end-users to advance the science and practice of preserving important digital materials that are perishable and often exist only in digital form. The Library now has a total of 256 terabytes of digital content under our management, including 66 terabytes of digital material preserved by 67 partners across the nation. By the year 2010 we estimate there will be double that amount.

But the Library also preserves and makes accessible 132 million traditional analog items (books, manuscripts, maps, music and movies) and we constantly seek to bring the best of traditional librarianship into the digital world. We hold fast to the principles of free and equitable access and long-term preservation. We have to transform much of our workforce into a new kind of knowledge navigator that draws equally on our new digital materials and traditional artifactual items. And we are helping develop standards and protocols for the electronic sharing of bibliographic records just as the Library did for the print world with its cataloging records, at the dawn of the 20th century.

Our new role is not limited to creating endless digital data files. We are here giving our collections context and meaning and offering them in increasingly expansive ways back to the world. We began this "first generation" of transformation thoughtfully and selectively. Congress encouraged us to create the THOMAS system in 1995, which has given public a new, simple way to access legislative information. THOMAS remains the predominant free access tool for the public to find out what is going on in Congress, and we continue to work with the Government Printing Office to add information from pre-digital Congresses. Congress also supported, with federal matching funds, our early public-private partnerships to digitize and make accessible our historically significant, unique Americana collections that had previously been available only to scholars visiting on site. Today, our American Memory website offers well over 10 million historical items, culled from our vast holdings as well as those of partner institutions from all over the country. We are also adding cultural materials from several international partner organizations.

Building on our early digital experiences, we have carefully considered how to make our collections and processes serve our mission in new ways that take advantage of new technologies. Again with Congress; support, we are providing or preparing to provide service to Congress and the public in many new and innovative ways:

- $ Providing digital analytic support on over 170 current legislative issues, available 24/7 from the Congressional Research Service (CRS);
- $ Planning and designing the upcoming release of a new program of Digital Talking Books for the blind and physically handicapped;
- $ Re-engineering our public delivery of copyright services to accommodate future growth in electronic registrations;
- $ Collecting and making accessible first-person stories under the Veterans History Project and other documentary efforts to capture and preserve histories of ordinary citizens;
- $ Working with teachers and university faculty to integrate our primary source digital collections into K-12 curricula;
- $ Expanding our international capacity and outreach through our Law Library=s Global Legal Information Network and the World Digital Library, discussed in more detail below.
- $ Creating of LCNet, a Congress-only website to provide online information about events at the Library and basic services (book loans, tours, space reservations).

Congress and the public's interest in our digital offerings grows significantly each year. Our websites are visited by 250 thousand individuals a day, on average. In 2005 the Library's collective major websites (American Memory, THOMAS legislative information, and Library catalogs) received 3.7 million "hits," an increase of ten percent over 2004. We project at year's end another 20 percent increase over last year.

In this new environment, we have not lost sight of our unique ability to bring our collections alive in traditional ways. Our knowledgeable curators work every day with scholars and creators who use the collections to create new knowledge. We celebrate reading and literacy every day through the efforts of our Center for the Book, partnering with institutions in every state. Each year since 2001 we have had the privilege of co-hosting, with the First Lady, the National Book Festival here in Washington, which has grown to encompass crowds of 100,000 book lovers meeting 70 authors from across the literary spectrum. We traveled from the heartland to both coasts to a "theater near you," featuring acclaimed baritone Thomas Hampson singing American song from the Library's incomparable music collections. We are designing a new visitor experience to introduce Congress' library to the crowds who will visit the Thomas Jefferson Building when the Capitol Visitor Center opens in 2007.

But the need to stay ahead of the digital curve affects nearly every aspect of the Library's work:

- ***Sustaining our collections***. We need to determine how to select, acquire, and store the digital and online works that are required to keep our collections complete and meet the information needs of our users. Our collections strategies must be current and agile. We will need to evaluate electronic databases, multimedia creations, digitally linked resources, and digital material in formats yet to be invented. We will work toward developing processes, particularly for items received through copyright registration and mandatory deposit, that accommodate both physical and digital items.

- ***Preservation.*** As digital works are added to the collections, we need a technology infrastructure in place that ensures that their content will be available for future generations. We are taking the lead on developing national solutions, making investments in basic and applied research by and through partnerships to ensure long-term storage, preservation and authenticity of digital content during times of rapid technological change. For example, we determined that most state governments lack sufficient capabilities and resources to preserve state government digital information, and we are now creating opportunities for states to collaborate on multi-state demonstration projects. We continue to leverage technical infrastructure capacities and expertise that resides within and without traditional library and archival communities, to encourage shared commitment to content stewardship.

- ***Access.*** Digital technology and networks provide ways to deliver content to a vastly broader range of Library users. In the last ten years we have made millions of items from our collections widely available through the Internet. We need to continue to take the best advantage

of these opportunities. We need to understand how users want to access and navigate through our collections and, to the maximum extent possible, meet the users' requirements, not just impose a system on them. We will think differently about how we describe material, working closely with other libraries that rely on the records we create. We will encourage the use of bibliographic records created outside the Library when appropriate. Our own cataloging efforts will focus on creating metadata that we cannot get in any other form. We will need to make such material easy to identify for Internet searchers, to keep it "readable" from one generation of computerware to the next, to authenticate the accuracy and reliability of electronic copies, and to secure them against tampering and unauthorized users. We will do this while respecting U. S. copyright law and international agreements.

- ***Our workforce.*** The Library's fulfillment of its mission tomorrow will always depend on the foresight of our staff (from the Library's inception through the present) to collect, preserve and make available human creativity. All of our Library staff need to use, and to varying degrees become expert in, changing technologies as they apply to our work.

To achieve these goals, we have begun an intensive strategic-planning process that will ultimately transform our collection policies, our institutional infrastructure, our buildings' public spaces, and our workforce. The Library has developed an agency-wide framework for program assessment of every division and support office. Congressional support has already enabled us to re-engineer copyright functions and to create a state of the art National Audiovisual Conservation Center. And we are developing new roles for key staff to become objective "knowledge navigators" who can make knowledge useful from both the artifactual and the digital world.

All of these processes will be carried out in the spirit of Government Performance Results Act, which will guide us in what will have to be a major transformation of our workforce. We must continue to integrate and be open to new technology and best business practices library-wide -- and to maximize fairness and diversity in building the workforce of the future. This work will continue through FY 2006, culminating in a comprehensive, updated strategic plan for FY 2008-2013, from which we will derive future budget requests.

Applying the expertise and dedication of our staff is necessary to meet these strategic goals. We have shared with Congress some of our ongoing efforts to ensure the professional development of our staff, through training, mentoring, and performance planning and evaluation. We have a large number of staff who are retirement-eligible. As retirements occur, our challenge will be to recruit staff best able to advance our goals.

National Audiovisual Conservation Center

A significant component of the Library of the 21st Century is the National Audiovisual Conservation Center (NAVCC) located in Culpeper, Virginia. The NAVCC is first and foremost a center to develop, preserve and provide broader access to the Library's comprehensive and valued collection of the world's audiovisual heritage for the benefit of Congress and the nation's

citizens. However, NAVCC plans matured during a period of rapid development in the field of digital preservation. Consequently, the final plans include significant digital technology with design and implementation efforts that have employed state of the art approaches and components.

Unprecedented in size, scope and funding for the Library of Congress, construction of the audiovisual conservation center has been made possible by a three-way partnership among the Library of Congress, the Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) and the Architect of the Capitol. Authorized by Congress (P.L. 105-44), NAVCC has been built and funded by the Packard Humanities Institute at a projected cost of more than $150 million, the largest single private gift in the history of the Library. To date, Congress has appropriated $53 million over 4 fiscal years (FY03-FY06) to support the facility at Culpeper, for which we are deeply grateful.

The genesis of this state of the art facility was the establishment of the American Television and Radio Archive (ATRA) in the Library of Congress as part of the Copyright Act of 1976 to preserve a permanent and accessible public record of the television and radio programs that are the heritage of the people of the United States. Thousands of items of our contemporary culture are acquired, preserved, cataloged, and added to the ATRA collection each year, making the Library of Congress the largest and most comprehensive research archive of historical American broadcast programming.

The Library's landmark 1997 study of the condition and survival rates of American videotape and television media since the 1940s was the first nationwide survey of its kind. It documents lost segments of broadcast history and the lack of archival conditions in which many important private collections are held, underscoring the critical need for the conservation work to be undertaken in Culpeper.

For the first time in the Library's history, we will consolidate its more than 5 million item audiovisual collections, currently held in less-than-ideal conditions in three states and the District of Columbia, at one state-of-the-art facility where they can be stored and preserved in an environment with the most appropriate temperature and humidity and made more easily available to scholars from around the world. The current design provides for 25 years of collections growth.

The Library's audio-visual collection consists of more than 1 million moving images of theatrical films, newsreels, television programs, educational, industrial and advertising material; nearly 3 million audio collection items including commercial sound recordings, radio broadcasts, and early voice recordings of historical figures, as well as more than 1.7 million supporting documents, screenplays, manuscripts, photographs, and press kits. To date, more than 2 million items have already been transferred to the Culpeper facility.

NAVCC incorporates the best of proven digital technology in systems that are being developed in a highly modular fashion, allowing nimble and cost-effective responses to changing preservation and access needs in the digital future. Cutting edge policies and procedures

developed at the Center will be adopted elsewhere, both internally and by the broader library and archival community throughout the country and the world. NAVCC will fully integrate the acquisition of born digital and converted material into a single processing flow.

The NAVCC campus construction began in August 2003 in two phases. The 415,000 square foot complex will include four buildings--under Phase 1 the Collections Storage and Central Plant were turned over to AOC and the Library in 2005. Phase 2, the remainder of the site, is scheduled for delivery in the spring of 2007; this includes the Conservation Building with staff offices, preservation labs, and a 200-seat theater. A separate building will house two large storage pods containing 124 specially constructed vaults for the delicate and combustible nitrate film collection.

The NAVCC campus will be largely underground, except for the west front of the Conservation Building, which will curve out from the side of the mountain in a half circle. In a novel and complex landscaping feat, the top and side of Mount Pony were scraped off the building site and set aside during construction. The earth is being replaced over the tops of the completed buildings, and the mountain slope and surrounding landscape are being replanted with 7700 trees, shrubs and plants showcasing 75 different species -- making the site the largest reforestation project on the east coast.

National Digital Library Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program

I am pleased to tell you about our success as we reach the halfway point in our national program to preserve America's cultural and digital heritage. NDIIPP, which Congress had the foresight to support so generously when it established the program in 2000, already has 67 formal partners (and will soon be adding more) operating under 28 agreements representing both private and public concerns who are working to collect and preserve digital content.

So far, we have made significant investments in three areas:

- $ Acquiring, preserving and providing access to digital content
- $ Engineering the technical infrastructure to support preservation, and
- $ Conducting digital preservation research to ensure that what is preserved today is accessible tomorrow.

We have brought diverse groups together within the digital preservation program that would likely not otherwise have the chance to collaborate. These NDIIPP partners are institutions large and small, other government agencies, companies in the public and private sectors, educational institutions, research laboratories and other organizations both in the United States and abroad. NDIIPP has become a community of practitioners sharing a complex challenge and leveraging what any one institution can do alone.

Because the U.S. Congress had the foresight to address the need for preservation of the most important digital content before it is lost forever, we have had the opportunity to engage a diverse set of experts in the technology and archival fields. The seeding of this network, a

community of committed partners, will produce by the year 2010 a national collection of millions of digital works, establish partnerships with over 150 organizations, provide for interoperability among the partners, and develop tools and models that make it more cost-efficient to capture, preserve and deliver digital works. The state of digital preservation will be one of shared responsibility and costs for what was once the responsibility of only a few large research libraries. Further, the network will foster the use of the collection as a national resource for educational institutions moving toward an information utility for the country. The humanities community is teaming with the sciences, NSF's Cyberinfrastructure Program, to make the national digital collection as comprehensive as possible. The transformation to a society where information will be as expected as electricity, water and highways is underway and we are really proud to be a large part of this change. By 2010 we will be well along to shared access to information across a network of institutions with defined roles and responsibilities for acquiring and preserving digital content.

With matching funds, we have judiciously made these investment awards across a broad spectrum of content and geographical location. Just last week, our NDIIPP partners (federal, public and private) assembled in Washington for their semiannual meeting. These pioneers in digital preservation are helping us spread the word about the urgency of saving digital materials that are at risk of being lost, and working collaboratively to ensure that scarce federal and matching funds are wisely spent.

By leveraging the expertise of the Library and its partners, we are learning how to build a national digital stewardship network; we are building a technical infrastructure that will ensure interoperability but allow enough flexibility so that current and future partners can join the network; and we are exploring public policy issues such as how to decide what is worth preserving and how to maximize scarce human and financial resources to assure the continued sustenance of the digital preservation network.

Our next set of investments will focus on sustaining our current partners and reaching out to new communities. Last May, we issued a Request for Expressions of Interest to all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories. We want to expand the NDIIPP network to include demonstration projects for preservation of important state government records (legislative data, court records and other state information) that is of vital interest to Congress. This request grows out of a series of three workshops we held in Washington a year ago that gathered more than 150 representatives from libraries, archives and information technology organizations. We learned about their interests and current work in digital preservation, the types of issues they face and how these commonalities of interest can be leveraged to advance the NDIIPP collaborative partnership network. We have received 19 expressions of interest representing 30 states, many of which will be partnering with the private sector. The awards we make in this initiative will help us determine the practicability of establishing multi-state facilities in various regions of the country for the storage of critical information and to assure data recovery in the event of disaster.

Last week we launched a project called Preserving Creative America. It is our initiative to join with the commercial producers of creative content -- digital film, music, photography,

other forms of pictorial art and even video games -- in developing strategies for the preservation of American creativity in all its forms. Preserving Creative America will help us identify common problems and solutions that are shared by private industry as well as libraries and archives. Of particular interest is the development of common standards for electronic deposit of materials submitted for copyright registration.

We have also issued a request for expressions of interest in continued development of the technical architecture that will ensure the accessibility of the digital content we are collecting. This work will strengthen the technical architecture that supports the content partnerships, including establishing environments for redundant, geographically dispersed storage of content; conducting additional tests to study how large archives of data can be transferred successfully among institutions without corruption; and leveraging the work of all the NDIIPP partners to create tools and services that can easily be used by others.

The missions of the Library of Congress, the Government Printing Office and the National Archives and Records Administration are complementary yet different. Our NDIIPP is focusing on the preservation of born-digital materials, that is, materials for which there is no analog, or physical, equivalent. These materials represent the cultural, historical and intellectual heritage of the nation. The National Archives is preserving the electronic records of the United States, and the Government Printing Office preserves the published output of the federal government.

Our 27-member National Digital Strategy Advisory Board, which includes eight other federal agencies and includes the National Archives and the Government Printing Office, has successfully come together in the spirit of cooperation to identify digital preservation standards and policies across the federal government.

Although our sister agencies are also engaged in digital preservation, there is no duplication of effort. In fact, we invited other government agencies, as mandated by the NDIIPP legislation, to be a part of our advisory board to ensure that the insights gained through the digital preservation efforts of the other agencies would have a forum for information-sharing. All the agencies on this board are deliberating on the best practices for digital preservation in order to make strategic decisions for moving forward and leveraging our respective technology developments.

As we enter the second half of this unprecedented initiative to preserve at-risk digital content, we will continue to demonstrate that we have a plan to maintain and grow this network, and that the information we save today will be accessible to Congress and your constituents tomorrow. America's dynamic democracy is built on the cornerstone of knowledge. If we take steps now to collect, preserve and make accessible that knowledge -- and to make others aware of this urgent need -- we will leave to our descendants an invaluable legacy to sustain this great nation for centuries to come.

The World Digital Library

The Library of Congress is making good progress in its initiative build a World Digital Library (WDL) for use by other libraries around the globe. The project is supported through funds from nonexclusive public and private partnerships. Our first partnership is with Google, which has provided $3 million to plan the WDL.

The WDL will draw upon the experience of the Library of Congress and other national libraries and cultural institutions from around the world to create an unprecedented collection of significant primary materials in digital form that document many different cultures. Content will come through digitization of unique and rare materials, including manuscripts, maps, rare books, musical scores, sound recordings, films, photographs, drawings, and other materials. Most of the material will be older and free of copyright restrictions.

A two-year process is now underway at the Library to develop a comprehensive plan for the creation of the WDL. Among the topics under discussion are technical specifications for digital scanning, storage and access; selection of material to be scanned; and governance and funding. Participants in the planning process will be the private sector, other national libraries, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA).

A number of pilot projects are underway with Russia, France, Brazil and Egypt. We are quite pleased that the Library has reached agreement with the national Library of Egypt in Cairo to supply equipment and training to produce materials for a pilot focused on Egypt in the Islamic world. The Library has also reached an agreement with the Bibliotheca Alexandrina to join the WDL to scan collections devoted to the history of Alexandria Egypt, from the 15th to the early 20th century.

This project offers the Library, and our nation, a fine opportunity to broadly share knowledge about different cultures. People from all nations will be able to learn from each other and help spread the light of learning and global awareness around the world.

Jefferson Building Visitor Experience

The United States Congress has collected and sustained the world's greatest repository of knowledge at the Library of Congress. Currently, about 1.4 million visitors each year tour the Library's magnificent Thomas Jefferson Building. In the fall of 2007, visitors will be able to enter the Jefferson Building -- either through the passageway connection from the newly opened Capitol Visitors Center or through the grand bronze doors above the Neptune Fountain -- and experience the art and architecture of the building and learn how the Library works to acquire and preserve knowledge and make it available. The new Jefferson Visitor Experience will complement the exhibits in the new Capitol Visitors Center and celebrate Congress' role in preserving the creativity of the American people.

The Jefferson Visitors Experience will focus on "Bringing Knowledge Into Life" with ten exhibitions that will highlight areas of the Library's vast collections and utilize state-of-the-art interactive technology to link the visitor back to the Library's on-line digital resources for teaching and life long learning. Anticipating the completion of the passageway from the Capitol Visitors Center to the Jefferson Building in the next few weeks, the Library has already begun raising private funds that will make the Visitors Experience come to life and celebrate the Congress' role in bringing knowledge into the lives of an even larger audience.

Signs, graphics and way-finding information stations will allow CVC visitors to move seamlessly to the Library from the CVC where they will proceed to orientation galleries on both sides of the Jefferson Building Great Hall. At interactive kiosks, visitors will be able to learn how they can pursue their interests and shape their visit. They will be able to pick up their Knowledge Quest Passports to use during their visit and link them back to information sources on the Library's website. As a central experience, visitors will take an interactive tour of the Great Hall to see the beauty and understand the meaning of the Jefferson Building and its relationship to the Congress and to the Library's history.

Exhibits will play a central role in the visitor experience.

The Library will reinstall Thomas Jefferson's original 6,487 volume library, first featured during the Library's bicentennial celebration in 2000, with state-of-the-art technology. This gallery will allow visitors to examine virtually Jefferson's books and their influence on this institution, his thinking, and the world.

The newly acquired Jay I. Kislak collection, which focuses on the early Americas from the time of the indigenous people of Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean through the period of European contact, exploration, and settlement, will be a centerpiece of the 2007 experience. Our current thinking is that visitors will enter the exhibition space from two possible pathways. The first, "Behind the Scenes," will take visitors through the Jefferson Building, giving them an unprecedented look into the distribution of books and other normally "hidden" workings of the Library. The second, "Journey through the World of Books," will allow visitors to sample a section of great books from different periods of history and offer an overlook view into the Main Reading Room.

Phase two of the Jefferson Visitor Experience consists of three galleries, each of which will have interactive features and a focus that emphasize important aspects of the Library's collections.

"Creating the U.S.": This gallery, replete with original materials, will begin with a focus on the creativity involved in the founding of the American republic. The remainder of the gallery will present materials from different epochs of the American past and explore how they have continued to shape the American experience.

"Discovering the World": With the recently acquired 1507 Waldseemηller world map as

the centerpiece, this gallery will present an array of maps and other materials that document the early explorations of the western hemisphere. The Waldseemηller map was the first map, printed or manuscript, to use the name "America," to depict the lands of a separate Western Hemisphere and to show the Pacific as a separate ocean. The 1507 map reflected a huge leap forward in knowledge of the world's expanse.

"Interacting with the Library through Technology": A highly interactive, new technology gallery that is child and family oriented, this space will invite visitors to experience a fun filled but in depth sampling of the Library's most compelling collections: dance, song, poetry, the country's revolutionary roots, examining the thinking and words of U.S. presidents, viewing multi media presentations of historical periods, and tracing the musical origins of popular songs.

Each visitor's "Passport to Knowledge" from the new Jefferson experience will direct visitors to our acclaimed website where they will be able to continue their journey of exploration in the Library's online collection of more than 10 million items. It is our hope that visitors will also leave with a deeper understanding and appreciation of Congress' role in creating and nurturing its Library and providing the means for broad access by the American -- and global -- community to the Library's collections.

All of this will be accomplished without any major reconstruction of the Jefferson Building space and with private contributions. The creation of the Jefferson Visitor Experience will not require any capital construction beyond completion of the CVC tunnel (which is under the management of the AOC and on time and within budget). Individual donors will be recognized for three years within exhibit areas, consistent with Library policy for the past decade. After its completion, the Library will have significantly more public and exhibition space than now and we will illuminate the building and institution in new ways.

My colleagues and I look forward eagerly to meeting the challenges and opportunities presented as we integrate the digital world into our traditional artifactual collections and maintain and make increasingly accessible the world's largest repository of human knowledge. It is an awesome responsibility but one which we relish. The Library looks forward to working with you and your colleagues in the Congress in the years ahead.

The CHAIRMAN. I was delinquent in not mentioning the 5-minute limit, so I encourage each of you to stay under 5 minutes.

Dr. Marcum.

STATEMENT OF DEANNA MARCUM

Dr. MARCUM. Chairman Ehlers, members of the committee, good morning.

Our primary challenge in these early years of the 21st century is to enhance and adapt digital technology, ensuring that the Library of Congress continues to be the world's leading repository of recorded knowledge in all formats.

As you well know, the Library of Congress has amassed an unparalleled richness of resources in all formats that creators have used, with print on paper being the most commonly used format.

We have in place a superb preservation program for print on paper and all other formats, but our immediate imperative is to understand the many new materials that are being created in digital form and find appropriate ways to add digital materials to our collections and to preserve them for future generations. Our motivation for creating a new kind of library, the 21st century library, is that information-seekers in Congress, as elsewhere, have discovered the ease and convenience of Web and search engines for finding information.

Publishers have responded by making more of their recent products available on the Web, and so have we. We have been at the forefront of making information available electronically. But the Library has not been replaced by Google. The Library continues to be essential because it brings together information in all formats and organizes and authenticates this information.

Equally important, the Library provides expert curators who make connections between and among information resources to connect people with the content in a way that is unmatched by any search engine. The 21st century of the Library of Congress will enhance, not replace, the Library by collecting the growing amount of information in electronic form that will never be in print, and the Library will continue to digitize parts of the print collections, as copyrights permit, to allow broader access to Congress, researchers, students and the general public.

Incorporating digital collections into the largest most comprehensive print repository will require changes in organizational structure, processes and staff skills. Through a program called Knowledge Navigators, we will bring the expertise of our highly skilled curators to the Web, making our validated, authenticated resources more accessible and more useful than ever before.

There is already evidence of the 21st century library throughout the institution. One good example of progress is the geographic information systems technology and our Geography and Map Division. Congressional needs for nuanced policy data overlaid on maps are already being met by the new technology. Since launching the Congressional Cartography Program, we have provided more than 230 custom maps to Members for their use in legislative deliberations.

An outstanding example of the transformation that will occur throughout the Library of Congress is the National Audiovisual

Conservation Center that is nearing completion in Culpeper, Virginia.

The collections of our Motion Picture, Broadcasting, and Recorded Sound Division consist of over 1 million moving image collection items, nearly 3 million audio collection items, and over 1.7 million supporting paper documents and photographs. The new facility in Culpeper will bring together all of these collections now scattered in five storage locations, as you see on this map, in a facility designed for their care and preservation. Thanks to the support of the Congress and the unprecedented generosity of David Woodley Packard and the Packard Humanities Institute, the state-of-the-art conservation center will preserve our collections and provide space for 25 years of collections growth.

The facility and its new technology will allow us to preserve the Library's collections four to five times faster than we can today and preserve our films three times faster.

Great care has gone into the design and construction of this building. The two charts you see, one an aerial photograph, and over here architectural renderings, show you the scale of the facility and illustrate the attention that has gone into caring for the surrounding environment. Construction began in August 2003. The collection storage building was turned over to the Architect of the Capitol in December 2005, and the Library began moving collections in February 2006. To date, we have moved 2 million items to Culpeper.

The conservation building will be turned over to the Architect of the Capitol in February 2007; staff will move immediately thereafter.

It is a privilege for me to work on these important initiatives at the Library of Congress, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today.

Now I turn to Laura Campbell, the Associate Librarian for Strategic Initiatives. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Campbell, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF LAURA CAMPBELL

Ms. CAMPBELL. Chairman Ehlers and committee members, it is an honor for me to be here today.

The transformation to a society in which near instant access to information is as common as electricity, water and highways is underway. We began our online National Digital Library with American Memory in 1995, now offering 10.5 million items online in one of the largest archives of commercial-free high-quality content on the Web.

In 1999, we extended that offering to include important materials from seven other countries. In 2000, we realized, and Congress agreed, that we needed a program to preserve important at-risk digital content that exists in no other form, born-digital material. The average Web site exists for only 44 days.

Bringing the rare and unique treasures of history from the Library of Congress's collections to schools and the general public was a bold departure from our traditional audience of scholars. Last year, Congress authorized the Library to roll out a national program for teachers and students in all 50 States, our "Teaching

with Primary Sources" program. In little more than a decade, we have built a rich information resource for the Nation.

Congress charged the Library, through our National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program, to build a national network of diverse partners in order to save and provide access to a body of high quality content in digital form. We have worked closely with content creators and distributors, research libraries, technology companies, museums and nine Federal agencies, including the National Archives and the Government Printing Office. We now have 67 partners under 28 agreements representing private and public organizations as shown on this map marking existing network partners in red. They are collecting and preserving digital content, developing the technical architecture that supports that network, and conducting cutting-edge research into tools and technologies to make the job easier.

Our next investments will double the existing network, as shown on the map to your left. The Digital Preservation Program has become a community of practitioners sharing a complex challenge and leveraging what any one institution could do alone. By the year 2010, we will produce a national collection of millions of digital works through partnerships with more than 150 organizations sharing responsibility and costs for what was once the responsibility of only a few large research libraries.

In 2008, we will make recommendations to Congress about the future of the network. We will expand the network by the end of this year in three new ways: first, multi-state demonstration projects will encourage States to work cooperatively to collect and preserve at-risk State and local government information. We have proposals involving more than 30 States now.

Second, a new Preserving Creative America initiative will target creative works from commercial companies, including movies, digital photographs and music.

Third, we will strengthen the existing preservation network through shared storage, tools and services from nonprofit and technology companies.

We are also teaming with the National Science Foundation's Cyberinfrastructure Program to make the national digital collection as comprehensive as possible.

Finally, in developing the World Digital Library, we are building on our record of successful bilateral projects with partners in Russia, Brazil, France, Spain and the Netherlands as well as enlisting new partners in the non-Western world beginning with Egypt and Mali, as indicated on the world map.

We hope to create, alongside American Memory, digital presentations on the memory of these Nations in a way that will bring people together from diverse cultures in a shared learning experience. We are working with UNESCO and our existing partners to develop the guidelines, standards and approaches for including countries around the world.

Thank you for your generous support for our digital programs. I am happy to answer your specific questions.

I now introduce Jo Ann Jenkins, our Chief of Staff.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Jenkins, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF JO ANN JENKINS

Ms. JENKINS. Chairman Ehlers, members of the committee, you have heard Dr. Billington and my colleagues describe the challenges before us as we position the Library of Congress for the 21st century. The use of technology in the digital environment brings tremendous opportunities for the Library to attract audiences that we have not been able to reach before.

With the support of the Congress, the Thomas Jefferson Building was reopened in 1997 after being closed for 10 years for renovation. Today, we receive approximately 1.4 million visitors a year throughout three buildings. Our expectation, with the Capitol Visitor Center opening, is that the number of visitors will greatly increase to somewhere between 3 and 4 million visitors in a year.

The opening of the nearly completed passageway from the Capitol Visitors Center to the Jefferson Building provides a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to showcase Congress's library and to draw into the Library many potential lifelong patrons and learners.

We are designing new exhibitions and experiences that will engage and intrigue visitors of all ages and will showcase the breadth and depth of the Library's collections.

Visitors will learn from our dedicated staff who will acquire, organize and preserve and provide access to our vast materials in every language and format. We have prepared a DVD that describes our plans, and with the Chairman's permission, we would like to show just a short segment to give the committee an idea of our plans.

The CHAIRMAN. You may proceed.

[Video played.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Ms. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, our plans do not involve any major construction in the Jefferson Building; they are in fact designed to complement the Capitol Visitor Center and to highlight one of the least known and unique accomplishments of the Congress, which is the preservation of the record of creativity of the American people.

As we increase access for a broader audience, our traditional scholars and researchers will continue to receive the high level of resources and research support they have always received. We are raising the funds from the private sector to bring the new visitors experience to the Library of Congress. On behalf of my colleagues, we appreciate the opportunity to speak before you today and would be happy to answer any questions. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you all for your testimony.

I will recognize myself for 5 minutes for various questions.

The first one I have to dispose of, just because it affects the many libraries throughout the country who are worried about this, and that is, providing control—the Library's decision to discontinue providing controlled series access in the bibliographic records that library catalogers produce.

As you know, you provide so much service to so many libraries, and they are so dependent on you. I just wanted to convey to you that some local libraries are worried about losing that since they regard the Library of Congress as the authority on cataloging information. I would appreciate if you would describe this function and

the justification for its proposed elimination. And I will refer to—Dr. Marcum, is that your territory? I will let you answer that one.

Dr. MARCUM. Thank you. Yes, we are keenly aware of the concern in the broader library community about a recent policy decision to stop managing the series authority records in the catalog.

I would like to put this issue in a larger context, if I may. As we move into the digital environment, we recognize that our biggest challenge is to connect the user with the content. It is not that cataloging will go away; more than ever we need to describe all elements of these digital files so that people will know what is available online. But it means, with a workforce in the same numbers, we have to set priorities. We decided that we needed to streamline our cataloging function following the rules that are meant for the print environment and focus more on the cataloging that will be necessary for all of these electronic materials. So we looked at the series authority records that are used by very, very few people. The series authorities let people know how a series title has changed over time. All of the use information we could gather indicated that about one-half of 1 percent of the use of online catalogs is for that part of the record. So we decided that we could stop managing that part and focus on some of these new digital requirements.

In retrospect, I believe that our failure to communicate promptly with the library community led to this great concern that we were going to be phasing out some of our high quality cataloging; that certainly isn't the case. In response to this issue, I have convened an external advisory committee. I have invited the American Library Association to name three representatives, the Association of Research Libraries to name three representatives, special libraries and law libraries, one each. I have also invited the search engine companies to name a representative to this external advisory committee, and there will be a few at-large members. We expect to convene this group to think about all of these cataloging issues in a cluster and try to think about cataloging in the new digital environment and develop some reports that will be helpful to librarians everywhere. It is a slightly long answer, but I think you need to get the full picture. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I just want to emphasize this point on how dependent libraries are on you. I am sensitive to this, having grown up in a town with a magnificent population of 800 people—it still has 800 people—and libraries of this sort are not too concerned about the digital issues; they just are trying to keep their heads above water. They are totally dependent on you. So please keep all those libraries in mind as we go through this process.

I have many more questions, but I am pleased now to note the attendance of our ranking member just released from the White House. The President apparently has decided he can run the country without the ranking member for the rest of the day. So we are pleased to welcome you. My time has expired, so I am pleased to recognize you for any questions.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I thank you all so much for being here. I am sorry I was not here at the beginning, but nonetheless, I am interested in the subject area, and I thank my colleagues for pinch hitting for me during my absence.

Mr. Chairman, I am just looking over these. And I suppose the one thing that I would like to ask in terms of the library management is, how many staff members will be transferred from Capitol Hill to the new National Audiovisual Conservation Center in Culpeper?

Dr. Billington, how many staff members will be transferred?

Dr. BILLINGTON. I can't give you the exact number, but many of them will be transferred, although not all, because the basic use of the collections for research and for the various purposes for which the materials being transferred—more than 5 million—will be used on Capitol Hill, so some will remain here.

These collections have been housed in three States, including in Dayton, Ohio at the Wright-Patterson Air Force base. Nitrogen-based films are pyrophoric, even explosive, so they could never have been stored here on Capitol Hill. Our facility at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is being phased out, includes employees, who will have the option to retire, but most of them will be transferred to the Culpeper facility.

The storage facilities, in Boyers, Pennsylvania, and in the warehouse just outside Washington, DC, in Landover, Maryland are not Library of Congress facilities. The employees at those facilities are not Library employees, and the ones working at Landover are not employees of the Motion Picture Film Broadcast and Recorded Sound Division, which is basically the division that is moving so many people to Culpeper. So I will get you the exact numbers for the record.

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I would appreciate that.

Dr. BILLINGTON. That is the general picture.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I would appreciate that.

Dr. BILLINGTON. That is the general picture.

Dr. MARCUM. I can add a little bit. There are 11 staff whose jobs will remain here on Capitol Hill. They will provide reference and technical functions in the Performing Arts Reading Room, which will remain open and provide services. All of the other functions will be transferred to Culpepper. For individual staff who have decided they cannot go to Culpepper, we are making every effort to find equivalent jobs here and we will try to swap jobs within the Library so those who wish to go to Culpepper from another part of the institution will be able to do so. We need all of those skills at Culpepper, but we realize there are some individuals who will not be able to go.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I appreciate your commenting on that because that would have been my next question: For those who did not wish to go to Culpepper, what would they do? So I am interested in that. The Chairman did speak to me on the floor last week to tell me that the majority of those employees were going to be transferred to jobs and that you did have the appropriate job swaps and other job transfers. And I was happy to hear that because we have worked very hard together to try to see how we could ensure that these employees did have safe landings. So we thank you so much.

The last question I have is what is the Library doing that makes innovative use of technology in schools? I think we talked a little bit about that, but can you just quickly brief me on that?

Dr. BILLINGTON. The entire National Digital Library, the American Memory material, was basically designed for K through 12. Our creators, who have always served scholars very well, were asked "Suppose your 11- or 12-year-old niece or nephew came in; how would you get them interested in these primary documents of American history? How would you explain that in language that would be understandable to them?" This is being sustained to a large degree in our World Digital Library as we work in collaboration with the National Libraries of Egypt and Mali and France and the Netherlands, Spain and Brazil. But then in addition to that, we raised some private money from the Kellogg Foundation and from Walter Scott of Omaha, Lawrence and Ann Scott, who were interested in this. We have trained about 250 crack educators, competitively chosen from all over the country from a wide representation, teachers and librarians in the educational use. So all of their practical classroom teaching experience in using this material is also on line.

In addition, there has been considerable congressional interest. We have in seven different States programs to train teachers in the educational use of the Internet, and we are developing a template so that any State can set this up. The crucial element is training teachers. Very often, even excellent teachers are not as advanced in the use of these materials and technology as their students are, because young people are growing up with this. The whole premise of this is to use the interactive potential of the Internet. It is not like television—even good television—which is essentially passive. You are a spectator witnessing somebody else's train of thought.

The idea is to engage them interactively—Give them primary documents of American history, all of its variety and richness. This way you get enormous diversity of material but within one unified American Memory Project. There are all kinds of interesting ways of using this that are being devised in the seven States whose various congressional delegations have collaborated to set up programs that we help work with them on, and to which some funds are devoted to helping seed this process of training teachers as well as providing the materials.

I would say that one of the most important innovations that the Library has done has been to add an educational function, K through 12, to our already historic function of training higher scholars and the like and using the interactivity of the Internet to get people back into reading rather than pull them away with essentially passive spectatorism of television.

New technologies tend to imitate the prior technology and the Internet has been excessively imitative, I think, of television in that it is a vehicle for commercial advertising and so forth, which is okay; but the market has not developed, so far, effective and widely used methods of training in the educational use of the Internet.

We have provided the material which is either public domain or we have express permission of the copyright owner to use it for this educational purpose, and people are free to download it. Kids can use it in all kinds of inventive ways. Teachers have the lesson plans as well, so we are making I think a substantial contribution to what everyone will agree is important for almost every problem

we face in our country; namely, improvement of K through 12 education. It is a free service and we have been well supported, largely by Congress, but there are also important private contributions to this. It is ongoing and developing and we will have by the end of this year a template for every State that wants to set up a program for better training. This is training of the teachers who sometimes, as I say, think this is excessively difficult. It really isn't difficult. It is not neurosurgery or rocket science, but it is an important addition to—not a replacement for—traditional education.

Also it is extremely important for this fundamental problem: the fact that almost 1 out of 3 fourth graders is not able to read in America. That is really a national disgrace, if I can get a little bit on the soap box.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I agree with you and my time is up. And I thank you so much, Dr. Billington.

Dr. BILLINGTON. That is our educational effort and we hope that this can continue and develop. Of course, we are only a small element in a very large sea of problems, but I think we invented this use of technology. We should be using it for one of our most important national needs.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes Mr. Brady for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Billington, I was pleasantly surprised to find out that you grew up four blocks from my house, in the great city of Philadelphia, and I am going to continue our relationship. I have an affinity for people who come from the same place as I do, as we all do; and knowing that you have to be embedded with some union affinity, I am sure. There is some legislation pending about the police officers that are employed by the Library of Congress merging with the Capitol Hill Police, and hopefully none of them will be harmed in any type of way or lose their jobs. I understand they will be incorporated in, but as you know, sometimes people that are on the job 15, 20 years, and close to pension and close to pension age, the qualification reclassification—they have to requalify—may be a little too rigorous. And I note you have your own internal securities there. And I was hoping that I could talk to you further about their situation and hope that they will not be unemployed or hurt in any way.

I understand also that you may or may not be able to comment on that, because hopefully there is an agreement that was made that may not need to be made public but; I would like you to know that I am going to continue that conversation and continue our relationship and hope that that can be taken care of and no men and women over there will be unemployed because of that merger.

Dr. BILLINGTON. I know what you are talking about and I want to express our continuing concern. We have had a lot of dialogue about this with our Congressional oversight committees, and I will defer to our chief of staff, on your question and has been working in this area.

The CHAIRMAN. Doctor, with our newfound relationship, I just wanted you to know I know, and I want to continue my relationship with you, but I will be more than happy to hear from Ms. Jenkins.

Ms. JENKINS. I just wanted to say that we are not prepared to comment on that. We are working with the House and Senate Committees to bring this to a positive resolution.

Mr. BRADY. If we in any way, shape, or form can be helpful with that dialogue, please feel free to let us know.

Ms. JENKINS. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back the balance of his time. The gentlewoman from California, Ms. Lofgren.

Ms. LOFGREN. Thank you. I was notified that we lacked a quorum in the IP Subcommittee, but by the time I had gotten to the elevator they had given up and adjourned; so here I am, back.

I think what is going on at the Library is very exciting. I am interested in a couple of issues in the testimony, written and also here, there has been a discussion about the need to access an open source and the committees you are putting together. I do not have all the people involved today, but I will send to you later the people who have been in touch with me in the private sector that are putting together an effort that may or may not mesh. You are the ones to decide that, not me.

On that issue, I was interested in the World Digital Library and our partners in that, and I notice that we did not have a Spanish-speaking partner nor did we have a partner in Asia. What is the plan for that, and is that something to be concerned about? I do not know whether Dr. Marcum or Ms. Campbell would be the one to handle that.

Ms. CAMPBELL. We do have a partner in Spain.

Ms. LOFGREN. That is correct. I was thinking Latin America. It is fine for Brazil to be our partner, but as the largest Portugese-speaking nation in the world, I am wondering is there an effort to broaden that in Latin America?

Ms. CAMPBELL. Absolutely. We have seven existing partners and we have recently signed agreements with Egypt and the national library in Alexandria and the National Library in Cairo—to extend that group of countries to Egypt. We are going to take the experience of our initial seven partners and import that to a broader audience, working with UNESCO and other communities, to make certain that we include as many countries as we possibly can with multilingual presentations.

This is a very big issue for us. And the underpinnings, which I think from your earlier comments you can appreciate in terms of how we build the architecture that supports this body of content, is very, very important; so we will be able to provide the security for it and we will be able to maintain it in several places around the world.

Ms. LOFGREN. Now, pursuing that, I am not suggesting who should be our next partner, I am sure that is a complicated multinational decision, but certainly there are some countries that are tiny and some that are huge and have more content to bring to the table. And certainly if some of those larger actors were not on board with us, if this is truly to be a worldwide effort, that would be a problem.

Are we reaching out to some of those sections of the globe to make sure that we are—we may be at odds politically, but we should not be at odds in preserving the culture of the world.

Ms. CAMPBELL. Well, for example, Mali is a recent partner of ours. We have preserved, working with them, digitized Islamic manuscripts that deal with a number of subjects, including law and poetry and the history of West Africa. We recognize in certain parts of the world there will be some stronger libraries and we will help them identify really interesting, fabulous and unique material from their region, and so we are including the small countries as well. It is very important.

Ms. LOFGREN. If I can ask—and I do not know whether Dr. Marcum or Ms. Campbell would be the most appropriate person to direct this question to—but we have got a couple of issues. One, converting our analog collection to digital; and the other is just simply collecting the digital world as it evolves.

Going to the second point, there was a discussion about Web pages that disappear and the need to collect them. There have been actually some private sector efforts to do that. And I am wondering to what extent our effort duplicates that and whether it is necessary to duplicate that—I do not suggest that that may be necessary—but also the reach of the Webs. I mean, are we going into MySpace and FaceBook, or are we just doing what is available to anyone? What are we looking at?

Ms. CAMPBELL. We are working with the Internet Archive, which takes periodic snapshots of the Web and has done so since the early days of the World Wide Web. They are one of our partners in collecting at-risk digital material in the National Digital Preservation program.

We also helped co-found an international organization called the International Internet Preservation Consortium where we are among 11 national libraries and the Internet Archive who are working together to develop common tools so we will be able to share material with other countries that are collecting their own domain materials. And yes, that is true, the figure that we rely on is that the average Web site disappears in 44 days. And it isn't just the Web site, it is all kinds of content, photographs and music and independent films and things that certain communities cannot afford to keep, such as local and State data, maps that are created on the fly.

Ms. LOFGREN. If I may, with unanimous consent, another 30 seconds. I serve on the Homeland Security Committee and one of the issues that we have at least touched on but not addressed very well is information that was generally available, and even published before 9/11, that now poses security—at least concerns relative to the critical infrastructure of the United States. Have you come up with a strategy for dealing with that?

Ms. CAMPBELL. Under the National Digital Preservation program, that long acronym, NDIIP we call it, we have a subgroup of the nine Federal agencies that are involved on our advisory board, and one of the things that we are addressing is preservation policies. Many of those organizations have come up against this issue where they had to take down material that was already out there in the public's hands, and so we are looking at those policy issues. We are looking at preservation standards: Can we agree on what the preservation standard is across the federal government, because it would make it easier for many of us. And we meet on a

regular basis. There are nine of us and I expect there will be a few other agencies that will join us.

Ms. LOFGREN. Is the Department of Homeland Security one of the agencies?

Ms. CAMPBELL. No. DOD has just joined us but we would be happy to have the Department of Homeland Security join us.

Ms. LOFGREN. You may not be happy.

Ms. CAMPBELL. This is actually a fairly desperate group. We need one another. There are not a lot of people who want to delve into the nitty-gritty of digital preservation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman's time has expired. We will start a second round of questions. I have a fairly lengthy question for Dr. Billington, and I ask that you bear with me through the length of this but it is a very important question.

Obviously, we will not finish all the questions we have today and so we will have to submit written questions on some issues. But the first major question, businesses around the world are well aware that in order to remain competitive in their industries it is no longer sufficient to possess a workforce comprised only of competent and loyal employees. Successful companies know it is imperative to build and sustain a highly skilled and nimble workforce that is able to not only survive but thrive in an environment where the pace of change accelerates every year.

In other words, it is not your grandmother's Library anymore. Obviously the Library is not in a competitive marketplace, but it plays a critical supporting role to the Congress, which needs to set public policy in a very dynamic world. Old models of human capital management that developed in the latter half of the last century cannot possibly fulfill the needs of the Congress and the country in the 21st century.

Dr. Billington, on this I have three related questions. Is the Library's human capital sufficiently skilled and appropriately deployed to support the changing requirements of the Congress?

Second, is the Library's human capital structured correctly to be highly responsive to the rapidly evolving environment in which it functions?

And third, does your long-term human capital strategy align properly with the long-term needs of the Congress in the next 10 to 20 years? I would appreciate your answer to this comprehensive question.

Dr. BILLINGTON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. That is a very good and central question. The Library's staff, through its different discrete areas, is at different stages in addressing this need for a kind of transformed workforce. The Library is not merely the National Library; it is also a kind of knowledge conglomerate. So if you begin with the institutions that most directly serve the Congress, the Congressional Research Service and the Law Library, you will find that they have almost completely transformed how knowledge is analyzed, gathered, and transmitted to Members of Congress. The Law Library with its global legal information network, 43 participating countries, increased usage last year. For instance, in 2002 they were getting 405,000 hits on their Web site; through June of this year they have got 6,751,000. So there is an enormous increase in the utilization of the institutions that most directly

serve the Congress in the transformation and integration of the new digital universe.

The Copyright Office is in the final stages of a reengineering to adapt copyright deposit and registration to the digital world. The technology staff serving the Library as a whole, was out in front of really much of the world and much of the private sector with the launch of the Library's Web in 1994, with its ability to begin simultaneously both the American Memory Web site with 10,500,000 items now on line and an enormous number of hits in educational usage, and, at the same time, the Thomas system. So the leadership in the digital field is fairly distinct now in the information program that we have talked about.

Regarding your question about the adequacy of our workforce in a competitive world, is it sufficiently skilled and appropriately deployed?

We have a couple of really profound problems that have to be overcome. First of all is the high degree of technological competence that is involved in this transformation. I think it is not an inconsiderable accomplishment to have taken the leadership role that we have had, particularly in dealing with direct services to the Congress. We have also reached out to new constituencies in the country when our workforce is not sufficiently competitive in what we can pay skilled high-tech workers, although we need them very much.

We also have the problem of an aging workforce. If you take the core of the Library—the Librarian category, some 850 people, 22 percent of our workforce—only 10 percent of those are under 40 years of age. More than half of them, 51 percent to be exact, are over 55. So we have a problem of how to replace skilled employees. We have a fundamental challenge that you have to have more and more people in the central library profession who have a variety of skills. The Library is full of people with one-of-a-kind skills developed over a great many years. The average length of service is 18 years. Forty percent of our staff will be eligible to retire by the year 2010. So we have a large problem of replacement and we have extraordinarily important needs to retrain current employees so that they can have a great need of flexibility. This is not always easy to attain.

We have important need for retraining but we do not have a particularly high training budget. While it is too early to predict the final outcome of our current budget submissions, we had a substantial—not exorbitant, but an important request for training funds to analyze this and project future needs in connection with our strategic plan which we are developing now. This year we are developing a very integrated strategic plan, but we had hoped to be able to analyze this problem and define it in precisely the terms you have requested, but it does not look like we will get much of that request. We have a fairly low training budget for one of the most specialty-intense workforces in the Federal Government. We have a great many problems. But the great thing that we do have is a very dedicated workforce, a lot of experience.

Another aspect of professionalizing the workforce is mentoring, succession planning, which has been fairly well advanced in CRS and some other parts of the Library. It requires the ability to have

people both exercising their job and training people who will succeed them in those intangible one-of-a-kind skills with which the Library is very rich.

I am happy to answer more detailed questions, but I would say that in terms of human capital management, the human component is the key to our future, really. We simply need to have more flexibility, and we are preparing draft legislation for the 110th Congress that will address many of the needs and many of the questions that you have posed.

I am glad you brought this issue up because it is the core need: the human capital and replacing the skills. And we need, as Dr. Marcum has mentioned, a new type of librarian, in a sense, that you can call "knowledge navigator" who is capable of both substantive knowledge, linguistic knowledge. We deal with 480 languages and new skills in the electronic world so that they are able to do for the Congress, and increasingly for the American people, one-stop shopping where you can get information that is dependable, you can sort through the unfiltered world of the Internet and integrate it into the world of traditional knowledge stored in books and other analog items.

It is an enormous challenge. It is one we are working very hard on, and I think in our new strategic plan we will be able to present a full and integrated picture of how human capital development for the Library of the 21st century will be conducted.

The CHAIRMAN. My time has expired, but I do want to say we will have to pursue this with you as a committee, both minority and majority. I think it is a very complex issue that we will be facing over the next few years, as you said, with all the replacements taking place. You have to recognize that the Library depends on two things: your storage media and your personnel. That is what makes the Library, and they are both equally important. So we are very concerned about the personnel issues and we will pursue that later. But my time has expired.

Now I would like to mention that I thought we were having votes, but in fact the House has recessed until 12, so I hope we can finish this panel, hear the second panel, and deal with that before noon.

At this time I recognize Ms. Millender-McDonald.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Billington, as you create this digital repository representing cultures around the globe, I know Google is providing funding for the initial planning for this World Digital Library. Has Google expressed an interest in continuing to fund the program beyond the planning process? Have other organizations expressed interest in participating in the program in this way?

Dr. BILLINGTON. We have no further absolute commitment, but we have expressed an interest in taking a look at what happens in this pilot phase that we are doing. I should say that this is totally nonexclusive—we hope to get other contributors, as well.

Yes, they have expressed some interest and it is important to realize that this is a nonexclusive philanthropic arrangement. We are very pleased with their support. When Mr. Sergei Brin and I conducted a telephone press conference announcing this, someone asked why are you doing this? And Sergei Brin said, quite sponta-

neously, I don't think it was programmed, he said, When I went to the Library I was looking at old Chinese maps and I realized they were telling stories that were very different from how far Shanghai is from Beijing. They were telling part of the story of these people. He said, I didn't know much about it, but I was kind of fascinated by it and I loved looking at this, and I thought other people ought to have the same opportunity.

It seems to me that this is a feeling that everybody has when they look at the treasures. What we are doing here is also showing the world that America has not only preserved and stored much of the world's treasures, but is giving it back free to those countries. These treasures are largely visual, a lot of maps, a lot of old prints, a lot of things of these kinds that will immediately attract an audio-visual generation and, at the same time, raise curiosity and interest and respect for the different cultures of the world. So we think that this is something that is going to attract other backing and we are very pleased.

The world digital Library is an outgrowth of our meeting of the frontiers project demonstrating the historical connection between the U.S. and Russia. We now are approaching a million items from Russia, and we are getting terrific cooperation from them. It has bilingual commentary. It compares America's movement west with Russia's movement east. It has been very successful. We have something like 36 Russian institutions sharing material, and we are, from the Library's collection, mixing them together in a virtual Library that unites and reaches across borders, which involves more than just the Library of Congress. Other American institutions are contributing to it.

The two pilot projects that we are doing in this initial phase are with Brazil and Egypt. With Egypt, we are getting parallel Arabic-English commentary. We are doing the history of Islamic science, which from the 10th to 16th century was in many ways the best in the world.

We are celebrating foreign cultures, not just cultivating foreign customers. That is the commercial world. Ours is very different. It also represents something about America, that America itself is composed of many different cultures.

Take the material in Mali. The President of Mali was over here a couple of years ago. There is an enormous amount of Islamic medical history that continued in West Africa because it was beyond the reach of the Ottoman Empire, where for a long period that great tradition stagnated. We are expanding our own understanding of the world, because it is bilingual, the commentary is in whatever language the country is, as well as in English. It is enabling young Americans in our already established educational program to learn about the world's memory as well as our own American memory in its various forms.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. That is really so great. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I have one final question and the rest we will submit to you in writing. But this one goes back a ways, under Chairman Thomas' tenure, which is better than 6 years ago. This committee spent a lot of time and effort working with the Library to develop standards and protocols establishing

comprehensive collections security. You may recall at that time we had some losses, some very serious losses.

Could you please provide the committee with an update on your continuing efforts to ensure that the Library's collections are being properly managed and protected?

Dr. BILLINGTON. I would ask to be able to provide it for the record in detail. In general, I think that the security problems which occurred and attracted a fair amount attention about 13, 14 years ago, have been successfully addressed. One of the first actions I took was to close the stacks to public access. Theoretically, it had always been closed, but there were so many exceptions. So that has all been secured. We have an integrated, well thought out collections security plan. Unlike most buildings, we have to have security not only in people coming in the buildings, but people leaving the buildings.

The Capitol Visitor Center will help a great deal because it will centralize the security clearance for people, but we are working also on making sure that we adjust to that.

General Scott, my deputy who really oversees the whole security side of things, is unfortunately not here this week. But I would invite anyone else of my colleagues to talk about it. Because the unique thing about the Library is that in addition to all the other concerns about security and national monuments and in addition to participating fully in an integrated way with the perimeter security problems of this Capitol Hill complex, there are the very special problems of collection security, because these are enormous treasures. And perhaps because it concerns the collections, Dr. Marcum might want to speak on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Marcum, you are recognized.

Dr. MARCUM. Thank you. We have a very active collection security committee that now consists of staff from the collections in the Library and our security staff. They have worked very effectively in identifying all the possible risks, looking at ways to diminish those risks; and consequently, because of their good work, I do not think we have lost a single, significant item since they have been in operation.

You probably saw all of the publicity about a person who was visiting all of the major libraries stealing maps recently, and many of our sister institutions lost a lot of maps during that time. I am happy to report that the Library of Congress did not lose a single map in that instance, and we are quite familiar with the person who was doing it; but I believe that the combination of the collection staff working with the security staff, tightening up all of those procedures, has been enormously successful.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. Does anyone else wish to offer a comment? If not, we will terminate this portion of the hearing and proceed to the second panel. But I would like to ask the first panel to remain here to hear the testimony in case there are further questions for you. So I thank all of our witnesses on this panel for their testimony. I now invite Mr. Dennis Roth, President of the Congressional Research Employees Association, for his testimony. Mr. Roth.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS M. ROTH, PRESIDENT, CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Roth, welcome. We are pleased to recognize you for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, ranking minority member, good morning. My name is Dennis Roth, President of the Congressional Research Employees Association, otherwise known as CREA, the union representing over 500 bargaining union employees in the Congressional research Service. I would like to say how pleased I am to hear both of you say this morning how important staff are to the Library of Congress, not just its physical resources but also its human resources. This morning I will focus on a small portion of those resources that exist in the Congressional Research Service.

I would like to focus my specific testimony on the style of management being practiced under the leadership of CRS Director Daniel P. Mulhollan and its consequences on staff and on CRS.

Leadership can be accomplished in many ways and we believe that the style currently practiced by CRS management is inappropriate, damaging, and destructive for a professional service organization. It is autocratic, centralized, and secretive. Staff who speak out and recommend changes to top-level management decisions are labeled disloyal and whiners, unwilling to accept change. This has led to an ever-widening gap in trust and respect between top-level CRS management and its staff.

CRS is aware that this problem exists based on two communication surveys conducted in 2002 and 2004. On both surveys, staff expressed a strong desire to have a participatory form of management; that is, an opportunity to be heard. Yet CRS top-level management has chosen not to do so.

We believe the event that triggered the decline in trust and respect was the major reorganization of CRS in 2000. Staff were never informed that a reorganization was being contemplated, and when it was announced, staff were told that management was not open to modify the major provisions of the reorganization. Because of this leadership style of "decide and announce," staff and top-level management began a disengagement, whose effects still exist. CRS analysts and information specialists are deemed good enough to work and advise the Congress of the United States, but not good enough to work for the top-level management of CRS.

Director Mulhollan's decision in September of 2005 to eliminate the positions of 59 production support, technical support, and audio-visual support staff was conducted under the same shroud of secrecy and autocracy. Analytical and research staff who rely most heavily on these support staff were never consulted. Thus the announcement of management's decision sent a shockwave throughout the service. The primary reason given for the RIF was that CRS had conducted "sound business practice" analyses, yet CRS has refused to let these studies see the light of day. The director has turned down requests from congressional committees, individual Representatives and Senators, and CREA. His unwillingness to give them to us has been found illegal by an arbitrator.

Wouldn't you think that any substantive studies supporting a business decision of this magnitude and with such dire consequences would have been released immediately? Like us, Many

members of the House were unable to comprehend the rationale for the director's decision, and in February of this year expressed their displeasure in a letter to Librarian of Congress James Billington.

Congresswomen Millender-McDonald and Norton and Congressmen Cummings, Gonzales, Honda and Wynn all stated unequivocally that the director's process for reaching this decision was "fundamentally flawed" and raised the prospect of open hearings. The hearings are now, and CRS must be made to explain and defend its decision in the open. We believe that the alleged sound business practice studies will be found to be deficient in sound cost analyses and insufficient to reach a decision to eliminate the positions in question.

Analyses conducted in analytical divisions in CRS a month after the announcement of the abolishment of the positions clearly demonstrated that the functions of the dismissed staff were necessary in performing our services to Congress.

CREA also remains highly concerned over the effect the RIF will have on the diversity of CRS staff. The positions being eliminated are held predominantly by minorities and by women. Some staff achieve these positions by participating in affirmative action and upward mobility programs. Approximately 70 percent of those who were targeted to lose their positions were African American, Asian, or Hispanic. Hard hit were minorities in the middle grade levels in CRS; that is, at the GS–8 level and the GS–12 level.

CREA, from the outset, pushed the concept of retrain and retain, but the position of CRS top-level management was to the contrary. They argue that RIF-affected staff could not be retrained for any positions that were to open up in the immediate future.

When CREA requested that Director Mulhollan utilize the occupational development provisions of our collective bargaining agreement, he replied that the employees could not be retrained for the new CRS positions. In fact, he went so far as to accuse me of being disingenuous and raising false hopes and expectations for those staff.

In January of this year, the Library opened up its On-Line Learning Center, or the OLC, as part of the Center For Learning and Development. The OLC provides access to about 600 on-line courses, including administration, finance and accounting, human resources, library science, and contracting officers technical representative training.

I personally approached the director of the center to investigate if he had been contacted by CRS to assist in retraining, and was disappointed but not surprised to learn that he was not. Furthermore, CRS's claim that they had more than adequately trained the RIF'd staff was found to be false by the arbitrator.

It is not too late to require CRS and the Library to offer retraining to the affected staff for present and future positions in CRS and the Library. The infrastructure for accomplishing this is in place. The Center for Learning and Development is there. What is lacking is CRS and the Library's willingness to do so. What a waste of resources, both the Library's training capabilities and the people who are being dismissed.

Unlike the leadership of our sister legislative agencies, the Government Accountability Office and the Government Printing Office,

our director has determined that our staff are disposable and their long years of service and commitment mean nothing. The director has also stated repeatedly that the 59 staff had to be released because funding was necessary to increase the analytical capacity of CRS. Of the 96 positions we have counted to date that have been filled since the announcement, only 34 percent, or about 1 in every 3, has been for an analyst or a specialist. About 18 percent were for supervisors or managers. CRS top-level management is increasing CRS's supervisor and manager capacity more than it is increasing its analytical capacity.

Are the salaries saved by eliminating 59 staff really going to hire more analysts and specialists? We are not antichange. What we are against is effectuating change through secrecy and inflexibility. We are not seeking co-management. We are seeking opportunities to be consulted and to influence major changes that affect CRS's service to the Congress.

The reputation of CRS was achieved and is maintained through the action of our analysts, librarians, and those who support them. Yet from top-level CRS management, we cannot attain the respect and trust that you give us on a daily basis. We seek your assistance in correcting this.

We wish to work with management to make CRS the best place to work on Capitol Hill, as it was when I first joined the organization 30 years ago. CREA also requests that you make every possible effort to pass H.R. 5328, the Library of Congress Employee Transition Act of 2006, introduced by Congresswoman Millender-McDonald, as soon as possible. CREA deeply thanks the Congresswoman for her efforts, not only for introducing the legislation, but also for all the interest and assistance offered over the past 10 months. She has been a source of hope and support for all of our affected staff. Now we need help from all of you to pass this legislation.

I will now be happy to address any questions you may have. Thank you.

[The statement of Mr. Roth follows:]

STATEMENT OF

Dennis M. Roth
President, Congressional Research Employees Association (CREA)

July 27, 2006

before the
Committee on House Administration

Chairman Ehlers, ranking minority member Millender-McDonald, and members of the Committee, on behalf of the over 500 bargaining-unit employees and over 260 members of the Congressional Research Employees Association, otherwise known as CREA, I thank you for giving us the opportunity to testify before you here today. As you are probably aware, CREA is the union representing all bargaining-unit employees of CRS, currently ranging between grade levels GS-3 and Senior Level.

My name is Dennis Roth, President of CREA, a position I have held for nearly 19 years. May 2006 marked my 30th year with the Congressional Research Service and early July my 35th year of Federal Service, including two years in the Peace Corps. Until the recent CRS administration I was able to participate in, and assist with, many changes in CRS and in the Library of Congress.

I would like to focus my testimony today on the style of management being practiced under the leadership of CRS Director Daniel P. Mulhollan and its consequences on staff and on CRS. Leadership can be accomplished many ways, and we believe that CRS currently practices a style inappropriate, damaging, and destructive for a professional service organization. This has led to an ever widening gap in trust and respect between top-level CRS management and staff. It is autocratic, centralized, and secretive. Staff who speak out and recommend changes to top-level management decisions are labeled disloyal and whiners unwilling to accept change.

The effects of this style of leadership on CRS staff became patently clear to CRS top-level management when the results of a 2002 all staff communications survey were released that year. The primary finding of the survey was that top-level CRS management's failure to allow and nourish two-way communications created an environment of distrust and disrespect. While some effort was made to correct the problems, it was short-lived. A follow-up survey approximately two years later yielded basically the same results. And this was the case even though many new employees had joined CRS. On both communications surveys staff expressed a strong desire to have a participatory form of management; yet, CRS top-level management has chosen not to do so.

We believe the event that triggered the decline in trust and respect was the major reorganization of CRS that took place in 2000. While many staff had major concerns over the substance of the reorganization, almost all objected to how it was decided and, ultimately, implemented. Staff never were informed that a reorganization was being contemplated by top-level CRS management and when it was announced staff were told that management was not open to modify the major provisions of the reorganization. Many believed that it was a form of retaliation against two analytical divisions that worked with the Congress in the identification of current and future issues, although there may not be any specific legislation. Being proactive was considered by top-level CRS management as a detriment rather than an asset. It was considered as not being of service to the Congress. Because of this leadership management style of "decide and announce," staff and top-level management began a disengagement whose effects still exist. To quote Teddy Roosevelt: "People ask the difference between a leader and a boss .... The leader works in the open, and the boss in covert. The leader leads, and the boss drives."

From my personal perspective CRS is being managed without respect and trust for the staff. This is indeed odd and inappropriate. CRS analysts and information specialists are hired into CRS because of their skills and abilities to analyze issues and problems and propose alternative solutions. We are good enough for the Congress of the United States of America but not good enough for the top-level management of CRS! I hope that will require CRS to explain this to you and have them alter their leadership style.

Most telling and most damaging to date has been Director Dan Mulhollan's decision in September of last year to eliminate the positions of 59 production support, technical support, and audio/visual support staff. This Reduction-in-Force (RIF) conducted under the same shroud of autocracy and secrecy. While the affected staff were being surveyed, believing that CRS was finally going to update their position descriptions, top-level management was scheming to eliminate them. Most distressing was the fact that analytical and research staff who relied most heavily on these staff

were never consulted. Again, the Director made a "decide and announce" decision rather than seeking input from the clients of the affected staff. The announcement sent a shockwave throughout the organization. The primary reason given by the Director was that he had conducted "sound business practice" analyses which revealed that the affected positions were no longer necessary in CRS. Yet, surprisingly, he has refused to let these studies see the light of day. He has turned down requests from Congressional committees, individual Representatives and Senators, and CREA, which an arbitrator found to be illegal. One would think that management would readily offer any substantive study supporting a business decision. Why has CRS top-level management worked so hard to keep the studies private? We should soon find out. In fact, we once again requested them in preparation for this hearing but CRS has not decided if they wish to challenge the arbitrator's decision. It should be noted that the arbitrator went so far as to scold CRS and the Library in her decision when she noted: "... many arbitrations, and much expenditure of resources on both sides, could be avoided if agencies routinely provided information needed by unions to make the important decisions of whether to file grievances and proceed to arbitration."

Many members of the House were also unable to comprehend the rationale for the Director's decision and in February expressed their displeasure in a letter to Librarian of Congress James Billington and copied to Director Mulhollan and CREA. Congresswomen Millender-McDonald and Norton and Congressmen Cummings, Gonzalez, Honda, and Wynn stated unequivocally that the Director's process for reaching his decision was "fundamentally flawed" and raised the prospect of open hearings. Hearings are now being held. We request that you, as these Members did in February, require that the Library give the affected employees "every consideration and every opportunity to stay if they choose."

We believe these alleged "sound business practice" studies to be considerably deficient in sound cost analyses and insufficient to reach a decision to eliminate the positions in question. If they really had substance they would have been distributed to all interested parties at the same time the intent to

RIF was announced. CRS also refused a request from us to conduct a cost analysis study to verify that its RIF decision was sound. What is top-level CRS management afraid of and what is it trying to hide? Until the studies are released or other sound evidence is presented, we ask that you invoke a moratorium on the RIF. Analyses conducted in analytical divisions in CRS a month after the abolishment of the positions was announced clearly demonstrated that the functions of the dismissed staff were necessary.

CREA also remains highly concerned over the effect the RIF will have on the diversity of CRS staff. The positions being eliminated are held predominately by minorities and by women. Approximately 70% were African American, Asian, or Hispanic. While five have found other positions in CRS, diversity is still heavily affected. Hit hard are minorities in the middle grade levels in CRS; i.e., GS-8s and GS-12s. A few affected staff achieved their positions by participating in affirmative action and upward mobility programs. They will now lose them under the RIF. In late May the Library rolled out a "Diversity Action Plan" but we have heard nothing from CRS on how it will address the huge hole the RIF has created.

One element of CREA's RIF grievance was the woeful lack of technology training given to the affected staff. The arbitrator agreed that CRS had not fulfilled its training obligation. She noted that "in 2004 only 12 of the 51 affected employees [does not include supervisors] received technology training and in 2005 only 2 of the 51 received such training. In fact, there were no technology courses listed at all for fiscal year 2005; the two courses taken in 2005 were in November of that year." These two courses cost CRS a total of $690.

CREA, from the outset, pushed the concept of *retrain and retain*, but the position of CRS top-level management was contradictory. In January of this year the Library opened its Online Learning Center (OLC) as part of the Center for Learning and Development. The OLC provides access to about 600 online courses including administration, communication, finance and accounting, human resources, project management, Library Science, and Contracting Officers' Technical Representative

training. I personally approached the Director of the Center to investigate if he had been contacted by CRS to assist in retraining and was disappointed that he was not. The decision to RIF had already been taken.

CRS top-level management argued that RIF-affected staff could not be retrained for any positions that were to open up in the immediate future. When I requested that Director Mulhollan utilize the occupational development provisions of our CBA, he replied that the employees could not be trained for the new CRS positions. In fact, he went so far as to accuse me of being disingenuous and raising false hopes and expectations.

It is not too late to require CRS and the Library to offer to retrain affected staff for present and future positions. The structure for accomplishing this is in place - - the Center for Learning and Development. What is lacking is CRS's and the Library's willingness to do so. What a waste of resources - both the Library's training capabilities and the people who are being dismissed. If only our Director valued staff as much as the Public Printer of the Government Printing Office and the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office and accepted the advice of the House Appropriations Committee to follow their lead. Specifically:

> **The Committee understands that organizational reform is difficult, however, the task can be achieved if strong and dynamic leadership is attained. The Committee extends the following advice gleaned from these successful agencies. It is critical that agency heads look to the future in planning these endeavors and that mid-managers and employees are participants as well as stakeholders in the process. The leaders and employees are guided in developing and embracing their own logical and clear strategic vision for the organization's future. Agency management needs to identify leaders at all levels that will embrace change, and never lose sight of the most important asset of any organization, the staff and workforce.** [Emphasis added.]
>
> House Appropriations Committee 2006 Appropriations Report

Rather, as stated in the Library's brief supporting its positions with respect to our grievance, CREA's efforts to save staff were hindering with the grieving process staff should be going through following the death of their jobs. What position could be further from the one recommended by the Congress.

The Director has also stated repeatedly that the 59 staff had to be released because funding was needed to increase the analytical capacity of CRS so that CRS could better serve the Congress. An analysis of the job openings since the announcement of the RIF last September to date raises doubt that this is accurate. Of the 96 positions CRS sought to fill over this time period, only 34%, or about one in every three, was for an analyst or specialist. About 18% were for supervisors or managers. While many of the analyst/specialist positions were to fill vacancies because of staff attrition, only a few of the manager/supervisor positions were for this reason. We find most egregious the filling of Deputy Associate Director positions in the Office of Finance and Administration and the Office of Congressional Affairs and Counselor to the Director. The Finance and Administration Office had 4 supervisors/managers for 14 staff. They now have five or one for every 2.8 staff. The Congressional Affairs Office had 7 supervisors/managers for 35 staff. They now have 8 or one for every 4.4 staff. The employee to supervisor/manager is also low in most other divisions. We do not see a major effort to increase the analytical capacity of CRS but rather an effort fill in vacancies created by those who have left. Are the salaries saved by eliminating 59 staff really going to hire more analysts and specialists?

We believe that CRS top-level management must be re-educated and be required to develop a management style consistent with the wishes of Congress. And they must be held accountable to do so. This is one reason why we are pleased that the Committee has given us the opportunity to bring these significant deficiencies to your attention.

I can assure you we are not anti change. What we are against is effectuating change through secrecy and inflexibility. We are not seeking co-management; we are seeking opportunities to be consulted and to influence major changes that affect CRS's service to the Congress. The reputation of CRS was achieved and is maintained through the actions of our analysts, librarians, and those who support them. Yet, from top-level CRs management we cannot attain the respect and trust that you give to us

on a daily basis. We seek your assistance in correcting this. We wish to work with management to make CRS the best place to work on Capitol Hill, as it once was.

CREA also requests that you make every possible effort to pass H.R. 5328, *The Library of Congress Employee Transition Assistance Act of 2006*, introduced by Congresswoman Millender-McDonald as soon as possible. CREA deeply thanks the Congresswoman for her efforts, not only for introducing this piece of legislation, but also for all the interest and assistance offered over the past ten months. She has been a source of hope and support for all our affected staff.

Now we need help from all of you. Passing H.R. 5328 would give CRS and other Library of Congress employees in non-temporary positions (who have successfully completed their probationary period) "competitive status" and eligible for positions in the Executive Branch agencies that are limited to such status. H.R. 5328 would also make Library, including CRS, RIFed employees eligible to participate in the Executive Branch Interagency Career Transition Assistance Plan for Displaced Employees. This program gives RIFed employees "selection preference" in filling Executive Branch vacant positions.

CREA hopes that through your efforts our affected employees will be offered other positions in CRS and the Library and will not need the significant benefits offered by this bill. However, it is important that the special status be established as soon as possible in the event that not all affected employees are offered positions.

I will now be happy to address any concerns that you may have. Thank You.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you for your comments. I allowed some extra time for you to complete it because I did not want to interrupt that narrative.

Just a few quick questions on my part. I am not totally familiar with the RIF process, but my understanding is that under the RIF process all the employees who are losing their positions are being offered other open positions in the Library of Congress. Is that taking place?

Mr. ROTH. That would be true if there are other open positions. As of my discussions with the staff person that is conducting the RIF, they didn't have at that time a list of any open position for them to be placed. It was unclear. They had talked to each of the service unit heads and had asked them to submit open positions, but at this point we do not know what was given back to him to say if there are any positions at all.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. My understanding is that there are some, and every attempt to be made to accommodate all the RIF employees, but I have not tested that lately. I know that my Ranking Member, Ms. Millender-McDonald, has a keen interest in this; so in the interest of time, because we will be voting soon, I yield back the balance of my time and will recognize Ms. Millender-McDonald.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Having served as a personnel director in both the public and the private sector years ago, I am concerned about a hostile environment that is not conducive to any type of positive working conditions. I keep hearing this coming up all the time, that the environment is very hostile.

Employees have to have respect and trust at all times, no matter who they work for, either for Members of Congress, for the President of the United States, or for the Library of Congress and the CRS. So I am very concerned and became concerned when I heard about these displacements or the attempt to displace 59 employees. Right away I spoke with Dr. Billington as well as Mr. Mulhollan about this.

Subsequent to that, I talked independently with these employees that were affected, without either the unions or the management present, because I wanted to speak directly with them. I think it is really very shortsighted, and, to some degree, rather telling, when management says that employees cannot be retrained, even though that management has never put funding in a program to retrain employees.

Now, this is my understanding, Mr. Roth. Am I correct in that assessment of saying that money was never put in? In fact, I think an article was in the paper here just the other day, stating that money was not put into a retraining program for employees.

Mr. ROTH. The director released a—I think it was a 5- or 6-year analysis of all the money put into training, and it was very heavily front loaded. In 1999 we had received a lot of training, and as we move to 2005, which was last year, almost no training was offered. The arbitrator in her ruling noted that only 12 out of 51 staff—because that is just limited to our bargaining unit—received training in 2004, and only 2 in 2005. This is training directly related because of technological changes that you needed to update your

skills, that was not forthcoming. As a result of that, she has ruled that staff who felt they needed to do it out of pocket to keep current, the Library should reimburse those people.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I did read that article. Has the Library reimbursed those employees who did take money out-of-pocket for retraining to keep up to the present technological advancements?

Mr. ROTH. Not yet. The process is that the Library has 30 days from receiving the decision to appeal any of the arbitrator's findings, and that would be August 11 by the way I calculate it. So unless we hear something that they are not going to appeal it, we haven't been told that they are going to fund it at any point in time.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I will raise that question with Dr. Billington in just a short minute. But the Chairman has said that he heard from both, I guess, Dr. Billington and certainly from Mr. Mulhollan, that those 27 or 29 persons who are the ones that are left from this 59 that initially were going to be asked to buy out and leave their post, were going to be reassigned. Are you suggesting that that is not the case?

Mr. ROTH. Well we haven't heard that at all. I talk to those people affected on a daily basis. I met, as I said, last week with the human resources person who has been contacted to deal with the RIF, and when I contacted him he did not have the responses if there would be enough. He was not optimistic, but he said he has to wait and see what people respond to him. So as of, say, the end of last week, there was no commitment by the Library or CRS to retain these people.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Dr. Billington, can you come forward, sir, and answer that question, given that the Chairman had spoken to me on the House floor that those 29 employees were in fact going to be reassigned to other positions?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just comment that we are approaching short time, so please keep the answers very brief, and we can certainly continue this discussion privately as well.

Dr. BILLINGTON. I will be happy to answer this and any other question in more detail. But I think on this question, we should defer to our head of Human Resources Mr. Dennis Hanratty. Let me just say, in general, that the Library is doing everything possible to minimize the impact of the transformational processes, which I have explained in some detail, on the affected staff. We are very supportive of your initiative in trying to see that we get the same additional rights in the executive branch as we have in the legislative branch, and we will ensure that those employees' rights are protected through strict adherence to both our regulations and collective bargaining agreements. Mr. Hanratty can speak to the specific question.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you state your name and title?

Mr. HANRATTY. Dennis Hanratty, Director for Human Resources.

The CHAIRMAN. That is for the entire Library of Congress, including CRS?

Mr. HANRATTY. That is correct. As Dr. Billington mentioned, we are protecting our employees' rights. The reduction in force commenced on June 29, and on that day I provided official notice to

the impacted staff and met with them to explain the reduction in force process. Since then we have met with each of the employees individually. Each employee has given us a resume of his knowledge, skills, and experience which we have shared with each service unit in the Library.

As part of the reduction in force process, we have frozen hiring actions in the impacted job series up to the highest grade impacted by the reduction in force, and we are attempting right now to place employees in vacant positions for which they qualify.

The CHAIRMAN. And when do you expect that process to conclude?

Mr. HANRATTY. The process, Mr. Chairman, covers a 90-day period. So the RIF commenced on June 29, we will continue our efforts through the months of August and September to attempt to identify positions for these employees.

The CHAIRMAN. What happens to the salaries of these employees?

Mr. HANRATTY. If an individual is transferred to a different position in the Library, then that position is absorbed, that salary is absorbed by the new service unit. Employees have significant protections in a reduction in force. For example, if the best we can do is to find an employee a position that is a lower-graded position, that employee has protections for his current salary for a 2-year period. And at the end of that 2-year period, we would move that individual up to the highest step within that grade and provide that employee up to 150 percent of the current step. So it is quite possible that even if the best we can do is identify a lower-graded position, an employee would be able to retain his salary.

The CHAIRMAN. All right. I think it would be improper for us to get into too much detail in this hearing. I think the issue has been brought to our attention.

I think it would be more appropriate that we thank Mr. Roth for his information. I learned some things that I was not aware of before, and I appreciate you coming here. I also appreciate the Library's honest intent to place them properly.

And I am always concerned about getting too heavily into any human relations issues in open session. So I would suggest, if the Ranking Member does not object, that we adjourn this meeting and that we continue this discussion and follow it through. I am certainly interested in making certain that we treat all employees of the Library fairly and we will certainly want to have further conversations with all of you to ensure that this is properly done.

I turn to the Ranking Member and I recognize her.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. I just wanted to say that I do recognize personnel issues and the importance of them not being publicly exposed. But there are a lot of times when there is litigation going on that they cannot be done. On a general note, you can continue to raise questions.

The only thing I wanted to raise was if you are doing the process, sir, Mr. Human Relations person, it is within the scope of collective bargaining that you have done with the union. And secondarily, every employee has bumping rights to bump into a comparable position with that same salary. And I would like to hope that this is what is going on in that process because that is where we bump

into problems when it comes to MOUs and that is what I wanted to express, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate your expressing that and, again, we will pursue that. It looks as if we are about to have some votes. Is there anything further you would like to ask?

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. No. There are many questions.

It seems like a vote is coming on. I do have an appointment back in my office that I have got to go to. I would like to ask, though, if the Human Relations gentleman—I am sorry, I did not get your name.

Mr. HANRATTY. Mr. Hanratty.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. If Mr. Hanratty and Mr. Roth and Dr. Billington and Mr. Mulhollan can meet with me to discuss some of those issues that we perhaps have not been able to get to, with reference to those 29 employees that we are trying to get positions for within the Library.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank you for the suggestion and we will arrange for such a meeting. If you want to pursue it at any time, we will certainly continue working on this issue.

We thank you, Mr. Roth, for your testimony. We thank you for the Library for the response. I think this is something that we should be able to work through without too much difficulty.

With that, I want to thank all of our distinguished witnesses for their time, preparation, and thoughtful comments, as well as the members of this committee and their staff who participated in this hearing.

I ask unanimous consent that members and witnesses have 7 calendar days to submit material for the record, including additional questions of the witnesses and also for those statements and materials to be entered into the appropriate place in the record. Without objection, the material will be so entered.

I ask unanimous consent that staff be authorized to make technical and conforming changes on all matters considered by the committee at today's hearing. Without objection, so ordered.

Having completed our business for today and for this hearing, the committee is hereby adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:04 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

Testimony Submitted for the Record

On Behalf of the

American Library Association

regarding the

Library of Congress Oversight Hearing

Before the Committee on House Administration

July 27, 2006

Submitted by Lynne E. Bradley,
Director, ALA Office of Government Relations
Washington Office
1615 New Hampshire Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20009
202-628-8410

On behalf of the over 66,000 members of the American Library Association (ALA), we commend the Committee on House Administration for scheduling its July 27, 2006, oversight hearing on the Library of Congress ("the Library"). This is a critical time to review the continuing technology, design and preservation initiatives at the Library.

While the Library's first function is to serve Congress, it also serves as a de-facto "national library" that has a substantial economic impact on libraries of all types across this country. The Library's tremendous collections, preservation projects, cataloguing and bibliographic functions, and, more recently, its digital initiatives make the Library a world-class resource upon which all libraries rely in some fashion. ALA applauds these services and initiatives and seeks to continue and preserve the collaborative working relationship the library community has with the Library.

As the largest and oldest library association in the world, ALA appreciates the complexities faced by any institution with limited resources as it makes decisions about digitization of materials and how best to manage evolving technologies' potential for new and innovative functions and capabilities. As our nation's libraries, including the Library of Congress, seek to move ever deeper into the digital world, there are many hard decisions to be made. At the Library, these decisions have a special impact on all types of libraries and library users. The Library cannot and should not move forward in a vacuum.

The Library's role in cataloguing and classifying the nation's library materials is especially important. It has occupied a leadership position in the development of standards of practice for bibliographic access to library materials for more than a century. Library of Congress cataloguing records comprise the largest single body of bibliographic records shared by libraries across the nation. These records provide the means by which any library - whether it is a public library, school library, college or university library, museum library, or any other library -- is able to provide users with adequate access to its collections.

The cataloguing performed by the Library and made available to the nation's libraries is one of the most critical national functions of the Library of Congress. A substantial part of the Library's funding by Congress is to enable them to perform these functions on behalf of the nation's libraries, of which there are a number in every Congressional district. ALA's support for such funding has been strong and long standing, but that support has been with the understanding that the Library will fulfill the role for which it is funded.

Any diminution of the quality or quantity of cataloging provided by the Library of Congress has an enormous financial impact on all of the nation's libraries, because the missing quantity or quality of cataloguing data must either be redressed by individual libraries, often doing work in duplicate, or it must be abandoned altogether. Any cuts to the quality or quantity of cataloging provided by the Library also has an enormous impact on the users of the nation's libraries - from the youngest child to the oldest man or

woman, from the recreational reader to the most serious researcher - in terms of diminished ability to locate and identify desired information.

Because of the great importance of these matters, ALA was prompted in May of this year to write the Library regarding its decision to cease the creation of series authority records and treating all series only via transcription in bibliographic records. ALA is concerned not only about the direct impact on libraries and their users of this specific cutback, but also on the process and dynamics surrounding the decision. At the same time as the policy regarding series authority control was being prepared, announced, and discussed, officials at the Library of Congress were indicating publicly that the Library is actively considering alteration of other cataloguing practices, such as abandonment or radical alteration of application of the Library of Congress Subject Headings. These changes would also have a catastrophic financial impact on the nation's libraries and their users and have been greeted with concern not only from the library community, but also from library users.

Our understanding of the background of the recent incident is as follows: On April 20, 2006, the Library of Congress announced that as of May 1, 2006, it would cease performing series authority work for the bibliographic records it creates. The announcement was greeted with dismay in the library community, in part because of the substance of the decision; in part because of the shortness of notice given; and in part because the decision was reached without sufficient consultation with the broad library community.

As a result of this response and to enable libraries to plan their operational response to the Library's new practice, the Library of Congress delayed implementation of the change until June 1, 2006. Although an avenue for comment was provided in the announcement of the delay, it appeared that there was no intent to consider modification of the decision based on comments received. While the delay was welcomed, forty days still allowed far too little time for libraries to understand the full implications of the decision, to assess their options, and to make adequate plans for how or whether they will continue to provide authority control for any or all series in their own catalogs.

For example, the Program for Cooperative Cataloguing Libraries (PCC) could decide to continue doing series authority work and take on the role of maintaining a national/international series authority file. However, this will mean many more hours of work for that dedicated group, to create Series Authority Records and to update Library of Congress bibliographic records that they previously did not need to touch. Because the PCC is mainly composed of academic libraries, we are most concerned about children's and popular materials.

Many children's materials are issued in series, and collocating these materials in a consistent manner through established series forms is crucial to maintaining good public access to materials in public libraries. In addition, the work of collection development and acquisitions personnel will be made more difficult, as it will no longer be possible to

collocate books in one given series; unless much more effort is taken in searching the catalog, duplicate orders and gaps in holdings are to be expected.

Controlled access to series information is one example of the important ways by which libraries and library users discover information or make it available to others. Keyword search is not an adequate substitute for authority-controlled series access, especially over time as variants and name changes proliferate, and as errors enter even the best databases.

We hope that the Library understands the impact that its decisions have on other libraries. Library of Congress bibliographic records are accepted without editing by thousands of libraries of all types and sizes throughout the world for use in their own online catalogues. Libraries accepting unedited Library of Congress copy will now lose controlled series access in their catalogs. If they elect to take on this task themselves, it will mean a great deal of labor intensive checking and editing of records -- labor that was not previously needed.

The American Library Association is also concerned about the manner in which the series authority decision was reached and announced, without sufficient opportunity for the broad library and cataloging community to discuss the impact of the decision, or to suggest modifications to it that would lessen its negative impact. ALA asks the Committee to require the Library of Congress to consult broadly with the library community, including organizations central to bibliographic control, regarding any future decisions to substantively modify the content of bibliographic records, and to take into account in reaching its decisions, the potential financial impact on all types of libraries, and the impact on access to library materials by all types of library users.

For example, if consultation with affected communities had been undertaken prior to announcing a final decision on the series authority issue (as had been done historically,) it is possible that a compromise or simplification of series authority creation could have been mutually agreed upon in the library community. Also, broad consultation of the sort described would provide a means for the Library to understand better both the costs and benefits.

It appears that the importance of Library of Congress cataloging to the nation's libraries and to the development of an educated and informed populace is not sufficiently appreciated by the Library's senior administration. The library community has come to expect, and appreciate, both significant lead time for implementation of policy changes of this magnitude and widespread communication with multiple and even international constituencies. Such consultation with the library community has been the model used in the past by the Library.

ALA believes it is imperative that there be a meeting or series of discussions of representatives of the Library of Congress, the ALA, and other interested bodies such as the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, OCLC, the Association of Research Libraries, the National Libraries of Agriculture and Medicine, and the Government Printing Office, for the purpose of discussions of the future shared responsibilities and roles of these

bodies in leadership and standards development for bibliographic control and intellectual access, and in the creation and provision of quality bibliographic records. We are aware that the Library has recently started to organize a similar group to plan a summit or other venue to discuss the future of cataloguing, although it is unclear whether the Library is willing to postpone and adapt its long-term plans regarding cutbacks and readjustments to cataloguing services, especially related to subject cataloguing, based upon the input from such a summit or set of meetings. We would also hope that the participants in such a group have broader representation as we have suggested in this testimony.

ALA urges the Committee on House Administration to continue its oversight functions of the Library and to require the Library to delay its implementation of future cutbacks in its bibliographic records functions so that there is sufficient time to enable informed response from the library community, including from organizations central to bibliographic control such as the American Library Association, the Program for Cooperative Cataloging, and OCLC.

The American Library Association requests that the Library of Congress return to its former practice of broad consultation prior to making significant changes in cataloging policy. It is understood that, despite the opinions of those who may believe that library cataloging has become fixed at some indeterminate moment in the past, in fact both policies and practices are in constant states of change and development. Nevertheless, unilateral and sudden actions on the part of leading agencies are likely to result in further fragmentation of the community. ALA specifically requests that the Library establish a 90-day comment period before implementation of future changes, so that the varied members of our community can make themselves heard, not only by the Library itself, but also by each other, in a considered and coherent manner.

Further, we urge the Library's leadership to re-dedicate itself to cooperative cataloging programs and cooperative standards efforts, in which both the Library of Congress and partner libraries can benefit from standards established together. All partners benefit from sharing standards and training; the result is a more effective and efficient copy cataloguing process for all partners when accepting copy from trusted sources. ALA and others in the library community stand ready to work with the Library and with the Committee on House Administration on this important effort. Such consultation and collaboration can help assure that the Library of Congress will truly be a Library of the 21st Century.

Statement
of
Saul Schniderman
representing
The Library of Congress Professional Guild
AFSCME Local 2910
before the Committee on House Administration
concerning the
World Digital Library
July 27, 2006

Chairman Ehlers and Ranking Minority Member Millender-McDonald,

My name is Saul Schniderman and I am the president of the Library of Congress Professional Guild, AFSCME Local 2910 representing over 1600 professional employees working at the Library of Congress. These employees are dedicated to providing the best possible service to Congress and to the American people.

On November 22, 2005, James H. Billington, the Librarian of Congress, proposed to create a "World Digital Library" for the purpose of bringing people together "by celebrating the depth and uniqueness of different cultures in a single global undertaking." On the same day Sergey Brin, the multi-billionaire cofounder of Google, Inc., announced that Google was contributing three million dollars to the project. "Google supports the World Digital Library," he said, "because we share a common mission of making the world's information universally accessible and useful."

In fact, the Library's mission is not the same as Google's mission. Mr. Brin says that Google's mission is to "organize all of the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful." Google has taken on a monumental task for one corporation, especially considering the copyright restrictions inherent in such a project. The Library of Congress' mission, on the other hand, seems to be more realistic and focused: "to makes its resources available and useful to the Congress and the American people and to sustain and preserve a universal collection of knowledge and creativity for future generations." The Library's mission is based on public service and reflects traditional democratic values of privacy rights, intellectual freedom, and open access.

In the past year, Library staff members have been hearing all sorts of pronouncements from top management that drastic changes are afoot and that the Library is in the process of making a "transition" to digital formats. "Providing access" to our collections, we are told, means digitizing them so that they are not "confined" within our Capitol Hill walls. The World Digital Library project has been announced and the Library will increasingly digitize its special collections for worldwide access on the open Internet. It's all part of a new vision for the Library of Congress.

But it's also a fact that the Library cannot digitize the vast bulk of it's holdings while the U.S. copyright law remains in affect. Any digital project is faced with this obstacle: you can't reproduce content on the Internet without first seeking permission from its author. The popular LC American Memory digitization project is boxed in by this copyright restriction and so its digital materials are either in the public domain or are made available with special permission.

We would therefore caution Congress not to regard the digitization of collections as the Library's central mission or core function. For example, our highly regarded American Memory project has digitized about 10 million items; but the way "items" are being counted needs qualification. Sometimes a scanned item is a photograph, a map, or a manuscript page. On the print side, the Library receives 1,200 new books every working day. The Library's vast collection of 20 million copyright-protected books cannot be digitized for free distribution on the Internet; it remains freely available only to onsite researchers and to other library users throughout the country via inter-library loan.

The point is this: while digitization projects are useful and prestigious, they provide access to only a microscopic portion of the Library's collections, and for that reason should not be regarded as core functions that are more important than existing operations, such as our cataloging and classification work. In it's rush to "transition" to the digital age, the Library should not lose sight of its core mission nor abandon its traditional base.

Our union was established at the Library in 1976 and we represent both catalogers (print) and conversion specialists (digital). Many of us have spent our entire careers at the Library and have witnessed significant changes over the years. But when the Library hires consultants for a "Digital Competencies Development Project," and a "Workforce Transformation Initiative," we wonder out loud: what are they really talking about? Where are they leading us? And why?

Part of Library management's vision of a "digital library" is an assumption that collections that are digitized and "freed" from their physical locations on Capitol Hill can be made accessible to the world through the Google search box. This gets a bit complicated so I urge the Committee to visit our website at www.guild2910.org for a more in-depth discussion of whether Google's keyword searching will eliminate the need for LC cataloging and classification.

The problem with the Google keyword search box is this: it is limited in that it displays the search results in "relevance ranked" order yet cannot adequately separate the wheat from the chaff. Google may be great for the quick information seeker, great for business, great for online consumers, great for the undergraduate student sitting in his or her door room cramming for a term paper due tomorrow. But it's not great for the serious researcher who wants an overview of sources relevant to a particular topic. It is not great for the scholar who needs to do extensive and in-depth research.

Typing key words into a Google search box provides access to digitized information through "relevance ranking." When you search on Google your "hits" are "ranked" through an automatic computer algorithm, determined primarily by counting the number of other Internet sites that link to the sites retrieved by the keywords you typed into the box. When I type the words "capital

punishment" in the Google box I get over 10 million "hits" ranked according to relevance. Even if I refine my search under Google's Advanced Search technique, I still retrieve all sorts of digital materials of no interest to me. In short, I can't discern the wheat from the chaff and, after a while, I give up on Google and try something else.

This is why scholars utilize the Library of Congress online catalog or come to the Library to conduct research. Catalogers at the Library create standardized category terms that "round up" all works on the same subject – no matter which keywords their authors have used, and no matter which languages the authors have written in. Because Library catalogers utilize conceptual categories known as "subject headings" researchers are able to systematically retrieve all of the works relevant to their topic, not just those that have the exact words the searcher could think of. Google searching, essentially, is confined to retrieving only the words that get typed in.

For example: if you searched the subject "capital punishment" in a Library of Congress catalog, the catalog would round up such titles as "The Ultimate Coercive Sanction," "To Kill and Be Killed," "Habeas Corpus Issues," "Fatal Error," "A Life for a Life," and many others in both English and a variety of other languages. This is because trained LC catalogers have applied a conceptual cataloging and classification scheme, not a computer algorithm that just looks at keystrokes. It is no wonder that thousands of libraries throughout the nation, large and small, depend upon LC bibliographic records for their quality and accuracy, as the best alternative to Google searching. And it is no wonder that, quite recently, the Executive Board of the American Library Association praised LC cataloging but also raised serious questions about management's apparent willingness to radically change, or even give up entirely, the practice of supplying LC subject headings .

Because of its design, Google searching gives you a super speedy retrieval of "hits." Unfortunately, the search results are often incomplete, haphazard, indiscriminate and largely confined to English language sources. AFSCME member Thomas Mann, a veteran reference librarian in the Main Reading Room and the author of *The Oxford Guide to Library Research* wonders if the national library of the United States is "giving away the birthright of American scholars in exchange for a mess of Internet pottage." His paper can be viewed on our Web page.

The Library of Congress is the nation's oldest cultural institution. It is loved by the American people, by the Congress, and by the staff who work here. The World Digital Library may be very prestigious, but despite the grandeur of its name, only a very small percentage of our collection can be made available over the Internet because of copyright restrictions. Such projects should not be allowed to displace core library functions.

If we go forward with Google, Inc., let's respect each other's competencies and unique roles in society. But let us always maintain support for the Library of Congress and its mission.