[House Hearing, 106 Congress]
[From the U.S. Government Printing Office]

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS

FOR 2000

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

____

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE

CHARLES H. TAYLOR, North Carolina, Chairman

ZACH WAMP, Tennessee
JERRY LEWIS, California
KAY GRANGER, Texas
JOHN E. PETERSON, Pennsylvania
ED PASTOR, Arizona
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania
STENY H. HOYER, Maryland

NOTE: Under Committee Rules, Mr. Young, as Chairman of the Full Committee, and Mr. Obey, as Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee, are authorized to sit as Members of all Subcommittees.

Edward E. Lombard, Staff Assistant

____

PART 2

FISCAL YEAR 2000 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATION REQUESTS

____

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

____

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
55-450 WASHINGTON : 1999

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

C. W. BILL YOUNG, Florida, Chairman

RALPH REGULA, Ohio
JERRY LEWIS, California
DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin
JOHN P. MURTHA, Pennsylvania

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Tuesday, February 2, 1999.

Mr. Taylor. We will call the committee to order. I apologize for our late start, but our full committee was meeting and ran a little long.

We meet today to begin our hearings for the fiscal year 2000 budget for the legislative branch. And as the former Chairman of the District of Columbia Subcommittee, I can't tell you how happy I am to be here today. In fact, I had a little deja vu. This was our committee room here, and I wondered if they just put me back, Jerry, and I came back in.

But I am good friends with Ed Pastor and the other members of our subcommittee on the minority, and I welcome our majority members, those who I have not served with on the committee before, and we will do our job, I think faithfully.

We have several new members and I would like to welcome our majority members. Zach Wamp isn't with us today, but Jerry Lewis of California, chairman of the Defense Subcommittee, is with us and I am always pleased to be here with him on any committee. Kay Granger of Texas is a new member who I haven't served with on the subcommittee, but I am delighted to see you here, Kay; and John Peterson of Pennsylvania, who is an outstanding member also.

Bill Young, our Chairman, may or may not be joining us. And it always will be a pleasure to have him participate. I served on the Legislative Branch Subcommittee in a minority position, and Bill was the ranking member on our side when I served there in 1993 and 1994.

For the minority, Ed Pastor of Arizona is a good friend. Ed, we are glad to see you. And John Murtha, of course, is always welcome and a good friend. Steny Hoyer I have worked with in a number of ways. And then, of course, Mr. Obey will be the ex officio member as Mr. Young is. So I think we have a good committee and a good chance of working together.

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman, would you yield for just a moment?

Mr. Taylor. Gladly.

Mr. Lewis. I am sorry to do this, but I should mention for the record that Ed Lombard worked for a number of years to get me off of this committee. He was successful for 4 years. But, Ed, not forever.

Mr. Taylor. I will keep that in mind.

We will insert into the record our subcommittee jurisdiction at this point.

[The information follows:]

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE

House of Representatives.
Joint Items.
Architect of the Capitol (Except Senate Items).
Botanic Garden.
Congressional Budget Office.
General Accounting Office.
Government Printing Office.
John C. Stennis Center.
Library of Congress, including:
- Congressional Research Service.
- Copyright Arbitration Royalty Panel.
- Copyright Office.
- National Film Preservation Board.

United States Capitol Preservation Commission.

Mr. Taylor. This week we received the President's budget which contains the legislative branch requests, which are transmitted without change. The staff has compiled the customary budget material. The members have before them Part One of the Legislative Branch Hearings, which contains the budget justifications and explanations of the budget request.

The budget request we are going to consider is around $2 billion, thirty-two million, not including the Senate items, a drop of about $9 million from this current year. I will say that while these are our beginning figures, on March 15th we expect we will have the Budget Committee's message on the floor, and that may change the entire numbers. The budget request we are going to work with then will be finalized, but we don't expect a large change.

The budget request for Congressional Operations, the House Joint Items, the Library of Congress' Congressional Research Service and Architect of the Capitol is $1.2 billion, down some $81 million from last year.

The budget request for other agencies, Government Printing Office, GAO, Library of Congress, is $769 million, an increase of $72 million.

We are now fortunate to have Chairman Young with us. As we move through this process we will consult with the authorizing committees and the Leadership to ensure that the bill we report conforms with the overall appropriations limitations. Our subcommittee will no doubt have to make adjustments to the proposed budget request.

This concludes my opening statement, and I would welcome any additional comments. I will yield to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, Mr. Young, if he has a comment.

Chairman Young. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I don't really have anything to add. I have had the privilege of serving as a member of this subcommittee for quite a long time and appreciate the good work that the subcommittee does and the very good relationship that we have had with all the agencies that come before us. Thank you very much.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

And Congressman Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. This committee is new to me, so it will be a learning experience for me also. But I did have experience with the Administration Committee when I worked with Chairman Thomas, and during that process, I learned about the different offices under our jurisdiction and their budgets and, at that time, their concerns. So I look forward to working with you and the other committee members to make sure that our ``House'' is in order, that we run it well.

Mr. Taylor. Are there other members that would care to make comments?

If not, we will start with our witnesses today.

[Clerk's note.--The Chief Administrative Officer, assisted by the Office of Finance, submits the House budget each year to the Office of Management and Budget. That material is then included in the President's budget.

[The House budget request totals $784.5 million ($784,510,000). That includes funds for the operations of Member offices, Committees, the leadership and the administrative operations of the House.

[In addition, the total ``joint items'' budget is $98.4 million ($98,365,000). The joint items such as the Attending Physician, the joint committees and Capitol Police are shared with the Senate.

[The other body will consider the FY2000 budget for Senate operations.]

Tuesday, February 2, 1999.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESSES

HON. JAY EAGEN, CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, OFFICE OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER
HON. JEFF TRANDAHL, CLERK, OFFICE OF THE CLERK
HON. WILSON S. LIVINGOOD, SERGEANT AT ARMS, OFFICE OF THE SERGEANT AT ARMS
JOHN W. LAINHART IV, INSPECTOR GENERAL, OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL
DR. JOHN F. EISOLD, ATTENDING PHYSICIAN, OFFICE OF THE ATTENDING PHYSICIAN

Mr. Taylor. Sergeant at Arms, we are pleased to have you, and you can introduce your staff. We would like to welcome the three House officers, the Honorable Jeff Trandahl, Clerk of the House; the Sergeant at Arms, Mr. Livingood; and Jay Eagen, the Chief Administrative Officer.

[Clerk's note.--Also in attendance are John Lainhart, the Inspector General; Ms. Geraldine Gennett, the House Counsel; John Miller, the Law Revision Counsel; and Pope Barrow, the Legislative Counsel. Dr. Eisold, the Attending Physician, will appear before the Subcommittee at a later time.

[Mr. Eagen is the chief financial officer for the House. He has prepared the House budget for presentation in the President's budget and to the Committee. Jay is the de facto ``budget officer'' and is capably assisted in that area by Mr. John Straub, the head of House Finance Office.

[As is customary for first time witnesses, John's biographical sketch will be inserted in the record at this point.]

[The information follows:]

John Straub, Deputy Chief Administrative Officer and Acting Associate Administrator of the Office of Finance, U.S. House of Representatives

John Straub joined the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer in March of 1998, and serves as the Deputy Chief Administrative Officer. In July of 1998, John also assumed the responsibilities of the Acting Associate Administrator for the Office of Finance, until a candidate is selected to fill this position.

Prior to joining the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer, Mr. Straub directed the Public Affairs division of Klein & Saks, Inc., a management consulting firm headquartered in Washington D.C. In this capacity, Mr. Straub served as both a liaison to Congress and various government agencies on behalf of select clients, as well as directed several communication, publication, and research efforts for a variety of clients and interest groups.

Mr. Straub began his career at the White House, Office of Administration, serving in various capacities from Senior Budget and Management Analyst to the Internal Controls Officer for the Executive Officer of the President. John has also worked at the U.S. Department of Education, and served as a Professional Staff Member and Budget Analyst for the Committee on Education and the Workforce (formerly Committee on Education and Labor).

Mr. Straub is a native of Lima, Ohio. John graduated from the Catholic University of America, and currently resides in Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. Taylor. Which of you gentlemen would like to start first?

Opening Statement

Mr. Eagen. I will kick it off. It is a pleasure to be appearing before the subcommittee as the Chief Administrative Officer of the House with the fiscal year 2000 budget for the House of Representatives and certain Senate joint items.

The fiscal year 2000 request for the House totals $784,510,000. This amount is based on statutory entitlements, actual spending history from consultation with administrative offices of the House. Overall, this budget provides funding for the member representational allowance, committees, leadership, and a host of legislative and administrative offices.

The fiscal 2000 requests are detailed in your subcommittee print document that follows the overhead accounts as they appear in the legislative branch Appropriations Act.

Joining me today is Jeff Trandahl, the Clerk of the House; Bill Livingood, the Sergeant at Arms of the House. In addition, the Inspector General of the House, John Lainhart, is with us. And Deputy CAO and head of the Finance Office, John Straub, and Mr. Tim Campen, the head of House Information Resources.

On behalf of the CAO organization, we look forward to working with the subcommittee on the first House of Representatives budget for the 21st century.

Mr. Chairman, I have a lengthy statement for the record that details the House's request, which I will submit for the record.

Mr. Taylor. Without objection, that will be placed in the record.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. We are opening the committee for questions, and I will yield to any member if you have any at the moment. I have some that I would like to ask.

Ed, I will ask mine last.

Federal Financial System Status

Mr. Pastor. Well, I remember maybe 4 years ago that financial management records were a high priority for the Chief Administrative Officer. And as I was leaving that committee, I know that we were having problems in implementing the system for various reasons; the consultants we had just weren't doing the right job. What is the status of it? As I start a new committee, where are we at?

Mr. Eagen. You are referring to the Federal Financial System, which is the accounting and financial records system of the House. Mr. Pastor, we are at a point now where the FFS system, as we call it, has been stabilized. It has been fully installed and is now functional as an accounting system for the Finance Office.

We are actually at a point where we are ready to make that system available to committee and member offices. It is a product that will allow member offices and committees to look at the records directly and actually see their accounts live, on line.

It won't have the capability to have the offices manipulate the data or submit things by electronic format yet, but they will actually be able to read the accounts on an active base on their computer screens in their offices.

Mr. Pastor. So I will be able to look at my accounts, both the current status of it in terms of what is spent, and what is left in my account?

Mr. Eagen. Exactly.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. Will it be necessary to replace the House financial management system? Explain the plan, timeframe, and estimated cost.

Response. Yes, the House financial management system will have to be replaced at some point over the next 5 years. The House financial system operates on 18 year old technology (mainframe, COBOL, VSAM). Additionally, the House financial system vendor, American Management Systems (AMS) at some point over the next 5 years will no longer support the current version of the House financial system. AMS along with a host of other companies are now developing and installing new client server based technology.

The Office of Finance is currently preparing a project plan for the replacement process of the financial system. The draft plan includes the House system development life cycle phases to replace the current House financial management system, and includes activities to develop requirements, analyze House business processes, develop an acquisition statement of work, and assess the market place for cross servicing and vendor products listed on the GSA Financial Management System Software schedule. The plan also includes the steps for selection through a competitive procurement, and the steps necessary to purchase and install the replacement system.

Once the draft plan is finalized and approved, a project to define the House financial system requirements will be initiated during the third quarter of FY 1999 with completion expected during the fourth quarter of FY 2000. The cost estimate for this phase of the project is $963,000, of which $500,000 has already been funded and the balance of $463,000 requested in the CAO FY 2000 request. Following this phase of the replacement project,a procurement decision is expected during the first quarter of FY 2001 with an installation date of the first quarter of FY 2002.

The preliminary estimate for the hardware, software, installation, conversion, training, and system enhancements is expected to be in the $5 million to $8 million range. A more complete cost estimate including system integrator, independent validation and verification, and out-year maintenance and operation costs remains under development.

Question. As you know, we believe strongly that all financial management systems in the legislative branch be compatible with each other. We want to strive for a common set of books and common system architecture. Are your plans compatible with those objectives?

Response. Yes. The Office of Finance is working with the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council (LBFMC) toward identifying common financial systems accounting processes and system architecture. In order to maintain effective coordination, the House has had LBFMC representation on the current FFS steering committee, and has done so since FFS was being implemented in 1995. As the House prepares to establish requirements for replacing the current financial system, the CAO is including LBFMC representatives to participate in defining the requirements and help propose common accounting and architecture requirements.

Two specific areas of involvement the Office of Finance will continue to evaluate with the LBFMC includes the development of overall joint requirements, and the development of a key set of core requirements which achieves the common goals sought across the legislative branch.

The LBFMC recognizes that there are unique differences between the House and the other legislative agencies, such as the difference between the legislative year and calendar year reporting of the House compared to the fiscal year reporting of the legislative branch agencies. These types of differences will require the House to maintain some unique requirements and operating practices regardless of the final system chosen. However, this does not mean that common system architecture is not possible.

Voucher Turn-around Time

Mr. Pastor. What kind of turnover do you have? Will the turnaround be 24 hours or will it be 2 days?

Mr. Eagen. In the case of bill-paying of vouchers and invoices, we track that on a daily basis and keep fairly immaculate records. Our average processing time for a regular invoice these days is just under 3 days. That is from the point that the office submits the invoice to the Finance Office to the point that the check is cut and the bill is sent out for payment.

Mr. Pastor. I read recently one of the newspapers where some members had problems in terms at the end of the year they were overdrawn on their budgets. Obviously, this is going to help them in finding out where they stand. Do you work at all with the new members as they come in in terms of being able to understand how their budgets work, so that they will not get in trouble at the end of the year?

Mr. Eagen. Absolutely. As you know, every office is assigned both a payroll and a financial counselor. So we have been making proactive visits to work with the office managers and the chiefs of staff in the offices to try to educate the offices to how the system works.

But in addition, working with the Inspector General over the last few years, what the House has attempted to do is to establish an obligations process. There are a number of expenses that occur for member offices that occur over time--whether it is rent or payroll--and what we have been trying to do is enhance the system so that the reports that members get on a monthly basis show not just the expenses that the office has made, but also the obligations the office will be responsible for somewhere down the road.

We believe that as this system is enhanced, it gives the offices better opportunities to manage their budgets and make sure that they don't get into any tight spending situation.

CAO Year 2000 Priorities

Mr. Pastor. In this term, what are your first two or three priorities and how much are they going to cost or how much money are we going to save?

Mr. Eagen. The top of the list for priorities certainly has to be the remediation of the Year 2000 problem for the House. The Chief Administrative Officer organization is the primary organization in the House that is responsible. Year 2000 is now less than a year away. We have a full-time project manager in place. We have it organized into 34 distinct projects, classified as mission critical and essential systems; and we are spending quite a bit of time making sure that, when January 1st comes, House systems are ready to roll. That, in a nutshell, is the chief priority for our organization.

Mr. Pastor. Not that I get most of my data from newspapers, but occasionally I do. A recent article said that we were behind on three information systems that we have in the House and that we may not be able to solve them or fully implement them by December 31st. Do you have better news than that?

Mr. Eagen. Yes, I can give you a very good report, Mr. Pastor.

That article is the result of a follow-on audit that the Inspector General's Office has performed. When I first arrived as CAO in August, 1997, one of the first things that greeted me was an audit report from the Inspector General on the Year 2000 computer problem. It was dated September 29, 1997. What the Inspector General attempted to do for the House in that audit, as I saw it, was lay out a road map, a set of benchmarks that the House might want to follow as it implemented its Year 2000 program.

This most recent audit was an attempt to come back and say, another year and a quarter has gone by; how are you doing? And he went in and evaluated the work that we have been doing.

What we have been doing, as I mentioned, is organizing the House's efforts into 34 distinct projects. Each one has a project manager. We have to submit a quarterly report to the Committee on House Administration. This is the December 31st edition of it. That details each one of those project plans.

We rate ourselves based upon each one of those projects, and we give ourselves a color-coded rating: red, green, yellow. Green good and red being bad. There were three projects that we self-rated ourselves on that we knew we needed to apply more attention to. They happened to be the same projects that the IG mentioned in his audit. Those were the fixed asset system, which is an inventory system; Federal funding; and, finally, the member payroll system contingency.

Mr. Pastor. Which is very important to us.

Mr. Eagen. Absolutely.

Let me emphasize that we have several layers of remediation under way in the House. We usually have a replacement project. In this case for member payroll I think the IG was trying to indicate our schedule is getting awfully tight for doing a full replacement. We need to make sure that our contingency, which is a backup, will be working as well.

We then have a third layer which is business contingency planning that we are working on right now so that if January 1st comes and something goes wrong we have some way to continue to do the House's business. That could be something within our control or outside of our control, say, for example, the power doesn't come on or the telephones don't work.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. Recently, the Inspector General raised some questions about the House's progress in meeting the Year 2000 conversion. As I understand it, we have provided all funds requested. We even did a supplemental appropriation last year ($6.4 million) that was over and above your budget request. Why is the IG raising these questions at this late date?

Response. House Information Resources has been working closely with the Inspector General and his staff over the last two years in conducting our Year 2000 program. All of the recommendations in the recent report had been discussed when the audit was conducted last summer and, where they could result in needed additional funding, they were addressed in the supplemental appropriation. The findings were not unexpected, nor did they raise issues that we were not prepared to address. This aduit, as HIR sees it, was in the nature of a follow-up to review progress in response to the 1997 audit, and to assess whether or not the program was on track for timely completion. The recommendations made are consistent with HIRs approach to the Year 2000 project and reconfirmed the actions HIR has been taking to complete the program prior to the critical date of January 1, 2000. HIR agrees that there is still a great deal of work to be done, but there is time and resources to do it. The 12 recommendations of the Inspector General and being addressed and, as the Inspector General indicates in the transmittal letter, the actions HIR has agreed to take will fully address their findings. Based upon the work HR has done and the actions HIR will continue to take, HIR expects to meet Year 2000 deadlines so that the House has full capability on January 1, 2000.

Question. Provide an update on the Chief Administrative Officer Year 2000 Computer Projects.

Response. Please refer to the table on the following page for the CAO Year 2000 Fact Sheet

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

House Page Dormitory

Mr. Taylor. We will go to the Clerk of the House.

We have heard with some dissatisfaction, I believe, about the condition of the page dormitory; and we in Congress, of course are responsible for the pages and not only legally but morally; and we are very much concerned about those young people that we appoint and who serve the Congress so well.

Apparently, there has been disagreement between the Inspector General and the Capitol Architect as to the safety of the O'Neill Building where they are housed. Can you outline what you and the Architect are doing? We will be talking with the Architect later, but what are you all doing to deal with it?

Mr. Trandahl. Absolutely. Again, it is another audit that the Inspector General just issued in December. And, within that audit, the Inspector General highlighted two statements made by the Architect of the Capitol or the Architect's staff.

One statement was made during an earlier review by the

Arthur Andersen consulting company in which the building was safe and habitable for the pages and that we had no issues regarding the structural safety of the building.

The second was a statement within a different report by the Architect that identified structural issues and the difficulties if they would try to retrofit the building or do improvement to the building. No matter what, the building would never able to achieve an optimal level of use and that the infrastructure was not strong enough tosupport ADA or OSHA improvements.

Based on those two statements, the IG found the need to fully review the structural, physical status of the building and whether or not it is a habitable situation for the pages to be in.

The pages moved into the existing facility in 1983. We do house 72 pages there through the academic school year program, and 78 through the summer program. We are very concerned within the Clerk's organization that we are providing a safe, healthy environment for the kids as well.

In response to the IG's report, I wrote a very comprehensive letter to the Architect requesting a full review of the physical situation of the building as well as the status in terms of any safety issues or other related issues that they can identify. I am still awaiting a response from the Architect.

Mr. Taylor. We will look into that more.

Mr. Trandahl. Yes.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

Question. What is the current distribution of House pages between the Majority and Minority?

Response. The Committee on House Administration has authorized 72 page positions in the Office of the Clerk. The current distribution of pages among the House Leadership is 54 majority and 18 minority positions.

Question. Are you actively considering alternatives to the O'Neill Building for housing the House pages? If so, what alternatives are you considering?

Response. On January 15, I forwarded a letter outlining issues and concerns relative to the House Page Residence Hall. My letter was in response to a finding of the House Inspector General related to potentially conflicting statements from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol on the physical condition of the O'Neill House Office Building.

In response to my January 15 letter, Mr. Hantman, the Architect of the Capitol, has forwarded the attached letter outlining issues related to the O'Neill House Office Building. The letter raises various physical issues that can be addressed related to the House Page Residence Hall. However, the letter also identifies underlying issues and limitations related to the current and future use of this building. It raises various options including relocation of the House Page Residence Hall to other existing building locations. Other potential building locations include: 501 First Street, SE and an additional building located on East Capitol Street.

At this time, further direction and discussion from this subcommittee, the House Leadership, the Committee on House Administration and the House Page Board will be required to determine and appropriate response.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Document Management System

Mr. Taylor. Your office has been working on the Document Management System for several years. We are trying to see what you have accomplished and what the progress has been.

Mr. Trandahl. In 1995, when the Republicans came to Congress, there was a concept that was created called the Cyber Congress. And the overall initiative here, the idea of creating this Cyber Congress, was to provide the public as much information on the Internet or electronically as available to lobbyists or to Members or to staff on Capitol Hill.

And the concept of the Document Management System is internally creating legislative information, that we create a complete electronic copy as quickly as we can and certainly as soon as we create printed copy so it could be put out on to the Internet. What the Document Management System is, is taking every unique step of the legislative process which all used to be independent and an all paper driven system to make various steps electronic and then to string them together so the information would flow into a single complete document. Such as, when a bill was introduced or when your statements were made on the floor, an electronic copy could be immediately or as quickly as possible available to the public via the Internet.

For the last two legislative cycles this committee has funded the Document Management System's concepts; and a series of contracts have been entered into, as well as a series of efforts between the House, the Senate, other agencies in the legislative branch like the Library of Congress as well as the executive branch to develop standards and systems that we can all utilize.

We are now at the point where we are going to be moving towards creating models of what is called SGML DTEs, which are document types, and begin the process of prototyping various legislative documents.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and the response follows:]

Question. How much has been appropriated to date for document management? How has it been spent?

Response. For FY'98 the committee appropriated $1.5 million for the Document Management System. The Office of the Clerk spent $1,524,305 in FY'98 on DMS development, the difference absorbed with other FY'98 Clerk funds. For FY'99, the committee has provided $1.5 million for DMS development. Already an estimated $300,000 has been obligated in FY'99 and the remaining balance is anticipated to be spent. For FY 2000, an additional $1.5 million has been requested for further development and deployment of the DMS.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and the responses follow:]

Question. On Page 6 of your testimony, you mention that your ``Document Management System'' will enable the Clerk's office ``to become the repository for House legislation and related documents for current and future use, for the general public, legislative organizations, and the House of Representatives.'' We already have the Depository Library system and the ``GPO Access'' system to do these things. Why does the Clerk's office need to do them?

Response. Today the House has to rely on outside organizations, primarily the GPO, to complete the electronic creation of many House documents. The DMS would allow the House to complete such work prior to forwarding the documents to other parties, such as the GPO for printing. By allowing the House to control the complete ``official'' electronic version of a document, the House can then determine its future release and use--subsequently decisions related to printing, etc. The GPO Access and depository library systems are simply distributors of the information the House provides. Their continuation is not precluded by the DMS system. However, the House would not be strictly reliant on these systems for distribution of information to the public.

Question. On Page 6 of your statement, you say the ``Document Management System'' will allow the House ``to become more independent for preparation, printing and distribution of official House of Representatives documents.'' Independent of whom? Why is that in our best interests? Why should the House assume that expense and burden?

Response. The concept behind the DMS project is to allow the House the ability to create ``in-house'' complete electronic text of documents and publications prior to their printing. This ability will then allow the House to rely on more cost-effective printing or distribution options. In addition, the DMS system will allow the House to more directly and more immediately release electronic versions of legislation to the public, etc.

Mr. Taylor. I would appreciate, too, if the letter you mentioned to the Architect previously--can be put into the record.

Mr. Trandahl. Absolutely.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

GPO AND CLERK DOCUMENT PRINTING

Mr. Taylor. Last year we had a suggestion that the Government Printing Office appropriations be transferred to the Clerk's Office. In your opinion, what steps should be taken by the Clerk and by GPO before such a change is contemplated? Do you have any opinions?

Mr. Trandahl. Yes, last year, there was an effort at the end of the Congress--a discussion about the continuation of an oversight entity called the Joint Committee on Printing. There is a single fund called the Congressional Printing and Binding Fund for both the House and the Senate to charge the printing of government documents that are printed at GPO.

Currently, the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk are the only two that can authorize charges against that account.

We have very good management tools in place right now, but in an effort to try to help assist to pay for a lot of this document creation efforts and print on demand and cost efficient activity within the House, the thought is that eventually the funds should be managed more directly by the Clerk and the Secretary. I am very supportive of that concept.

At the same time, there are other issues within Title 44 which govern all government printing that need to be addressed along with that. So, last year, I think the final determination by the policymakers was to have a more comprehensive look at Title 44 when providing for the transfer of the account.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. How much of the material we send to the GPO is in an electronic format? Does that information go on to the Internet directly from your office before it's printed by the GPO? Can you estimate the percentage of copies of the Congressional Record and other House documents thrown away without ever being read or opened?

Response. Except in specific, limited instances noted below, all House official printing is now conveyed to the GPO by either electronic transmission, diskette, or minimally, by camera ready copy, particularly for official stationery. Documents including the Congressional Record, House Bills, and Committee Reports are subject to editing at the GPO prior to printing. House delivery of electronic copy to the GPO became standard policy with the 105th Congress, in great part due to the inauguration of THOMAS. An understanding of the scope of electronic copy transmission can best be illustrated in the context of the major House printing requirements, as follows:

Congressional Record: total electronic transmission for Votes, Bills & Resolutions, Executive Communications, and Additional Co-sponsors: Digest Section by diskette; Floor Proceedings without Member edits transmitted all electronically; Extensions of Remarks by paper copy.

House Documents (Committee Reports, Hearings): hearings are transmitted and edited electronically; reports are generally conveyed by diskette, with accompanying hard copy.

Introduced Bills/Resolutions (exclusive of Committee on Appropriations) and Amendments for Printing in the Record: transmitted electronically if drafted through Legislative Counsel, subject to hand edits on accompanying hard copy.

House Calendar: electronic transmission.

Official Stationery: generally manual edits to previously printed copy.

Major legislative documents, including the Congressional Record, the House Calendar, Bills and Resolutions, and Committee Reports are made available to the Internet via transmission to the GPO. The Clerk posts Votes directly to the Internet through our website. With increased public reliance on the Internet, the necessity for having a significant inventory of official House documents, particularly the Congressional Record, certainly has diminished. Recent GPO testimony supports this conclusion, citing a nearly fifty percent reduction from ten years ago in the House allotment of the Record-from 17,000 copies of 9,000 copies. Although we cannot measure the disposition of official printed matter once within Member and

Committee offices, reductions to the current statutory distribution levels for the House (referred to in law as the ``House Document Room'') could be tolerated.

Comments on the year 2000

Mr. Taylor. I can go on.
Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman, if I could, just a couple of questions----
Mr. Taylor. Yes, go ahead.
Mr. Lewis [continuing]. Specifically of the Clerk, if I could.
In the subcommittee I used to chair for 4 years we were talking to all of our agencies, a variety and mix of agencies, about potential Y2K problems long before it became common for people to talk about it. Their response over the years has been very, very mixed in terms of what they actually have done, how serious they have taken it, et cetera.
I certainly hope that the legislative branch of the Federal government will be way ahead of those other branches. I have heard your assurances, but it is awfully important that we be ahead of the curve or, we will be criticized if we don't do a good job.

Member accounts and spending practices

Separate from that, Mr. Pastor asked the question about accounts of Members and Members having some difficulty with their accounts; and you suggested that there is a mechanism for communicating and keeping track of these accounts.
In the past, there have been Members who found themselves short and they found themselves having to make up for the shortfall. Was counseling provided ahead of the time all those circumstances and, if so, with what kind of a results?
Mr. Eagen. Mr. Lewis, I can only speak to the 2 years in which I have been CAO.
Mr. Lewis. Do you have a staff person that has been around that can speak to it?
Mr. Eagen. I don't think I do.
Mr. Lewis. I am sure you know the history, but I am not going to let you just cop out to your own.
Mr. Eagen. I will try to speak to my own experience to what we have been doing for the last two cycles.
Mr. Lewis. And in doing that you might speak to what they had been doing too.
Mr. Eagen. I will attempt to.
We do, starting in early summer, begin looking at members' accounts to see what their spending patterns are starting to show. And depending on what it shows, we will start conversations with the member offices to advise them that we see a spending trend that perhaps requires some reconsideration or adjustment in their spending practices.
The Committee on House Administration, House Oversight in the last Congress, actually adopted a new policy that says there will be no overspending on the part of members, and that we are now instructed when we get to a more serious stage, which is really September on a calendar-year basis, to more

aggressively go to those offices that may not have taken corrective action. We are now authorized later in the budget cycle to actually deny payment of certain bills in cases where the actions haven't been taken.

So there are mechanisms in place that I think will get us to the point where there will be none of those situations.

Mr. Lewis. These questions are private and the businessof the individual office, certainly.

Mr. Eagen. Absolutely.

MEMBER ACCOUNT POLICY

Mr. Lewis. Nonetheless, when you get to that point you could potentially affect the institution. And Mr. Chairman, I am just asking myself out loud and for the record, but rhetorically to our staff as well, should we think through a process whereby in a timely way the Clerk, in a professional way, is urged to discuss either with you and/or with the leadership on whichever the side of the aisle may be involved to make sure that we don't find ourselves unnecessarily embarrassing ourselves and affecting our members in a way that isn't good for them, let alone us.

Mr. Eagen. Mr. Lewis, if I may, I think that process is already in place. But it works through the Committee on House Administration as the authorizing vehicle for the administration of these kinds of programs. So when there is a problem of that nature, our regulations from the Committee on House Administration require us to notify the chairman and the ranking member as appropriate.

Mr. Lewis. Is that a new requirement?

Mr. Eagen. This policy was put in place about 10 months ago.

Mr. Lewis. Okay. So we have yet to test it.

Mr. Eagen. No, it was tested this fall.

Mr. Lewis. Elaborate on that a bit.

Mr. Eagen. At the end of the year, as I noted, we went through an evaluation, a forecasting process on members' accounts. In those cases where we felt that people were getting close to the line and we did not get resolution, we would then go to the committee and ask for a higher level of assistance.

Mr. Lewis. And what kind of response did you get to that? Did you get assistance?

Mr. Eagen. Yes, at this point in 1998, we did not have any member who was in such a situation.

Mr. Lewis. That is what I am interested in. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, no further questions.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. What actions have been taken by the House Administration Committee which give rise to the request for the MRA?

Response. The Committee on House Administration took the following policy actions that led to an increase in the MRA costs for 1999.

Equipment--Members will incur 100% of all equipment maintenance costs and annual increases on equipment effective January 1, 1999. Prior to this, the CAO incurred these costs.

This includes expenses on equipment formerly grandfathered (acquired prior to January 1992). The annual cost is $1,099,000 of which the prorated amount of $824,250 has been transferred to the Members' Representational Allowance.

District Office Telephones--Certain costs for local service in the District Offices were previously subsidized by HIR Communications. This subsidy amounted to approximately $1.2 million per year. Beginning January 1, 1999, the District Offices are being charged the full cost, and the amount that HIR Communications had budgeted ($900,000) for the subsidy for this period is being transferred to the Members' Representational Allowance.

The annual cost for both the telephone ($1,200,000) and equipment ($1,099,000) subsidies were divided and evenly distributed to the Members 1999 allowance by the Committee on House Administration. The Subcommittee approved a reprogramming of funds from the CAO budget to the fiscal 1999 MRA budget, dated December 18, 1998, in support of the policy change.

Question. What formulas are used to determine the amount of travel funds that go into the MRA? Are there any provisions for high cost air travel markets in these formulas?

Response. The 1999 Members Representational Allowance is calculated by the Committee on House Administration based on three components--personnel, official expenses and official mail. Travel costs are included in the Official Expense component based on a historical formula. The formula equals the dollar equivalent of 64 times the rate per mile multiplied by the mileage between the District of Columbia and the furthest point in the Members' district, according to the Rand McNally Standard Highway Mileage, Guide, plus ten percent. There are no provisions for high cost travel markets at this time. The following rates per mile apply:

Under 500 miles	$0.39
At least 500 but less than 750 miles	.35
At least 750 but less than 1000 miles	.33
At least 1000 but less than 1,750 miles	.32
At least 1,750 but less than 2,250 miles	.29
At least 2,250 but less than 2,500 miles	.26
At least 2,500 but less than 3,000 miles	.25
3,000 miles or more	.23

Question. Formulas are used to determine the amount of funds for telecommunications into the MRA, especially cellular phones. Are there any provisions for high cost cell phone markets, such as largely rural districts in these formulas?

Reponse. There are currently no specific provisions for high cost cell phone markets. The cellular industry is trending toward more nationwide coverage options and toward a greater emphasis on flat-rate pricing. So the ideal pricing plan depends heavily on a Member's individual calling patterns and volume. HIR Communications has begun a program with Bell Atlantic Mobile, the carrier used by most Members, to begin regular reviews of Members' calling characteristics to identify those who could benefit from a different pricing plan. The first report from Bell Atlantic Mobile is due in February.

Currently, the SingleRate USA plan is the best hedge against high District cellular charges offered by Bell Atlantic Mobile. It provides, 1,600 minutes for $160 per month, with no roaming or long distance charges. This is comparable to the nationwide options offered by other carriers, and Bell Atlantic Mobile provides extensive coverage in the Washington area.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, Mr. Lewis. Other members?

Mr. Pastor. Mr. Chairman, I have one more.

Mr. Taylor. Certainly.

Equipment Uniformity During Increasing Technology

Mr. Pastor. I remember about maybe 4 years back, we had a task force to bring every member's office to the newest technology as it dealt with computers and it was about that time that I joined the team and the effort and went ahead and changed my company and computers and software and all of that.

Last year, just to make sure that I was on board, again a vendor came and said, no, no, we are now going even further and next year you are going to be out of sync with everybody. Are there uniform regulations now which every member has to meet in terms of being in place with the new technology and what is the status of the different members' offices? Are we all there? Are we lacking or where are we on this thing?

Mr. Eagen. There is not a regulation but a standard. To be clear, the philosophy in the House for years has been that the primary call on these kinds of decisions rests with the members and their staff. All of us who have been around Congress remember when Bill Natcher insisted on keeping typewriters. If a member prefers to manage his office that way and satisfies his constituents that is what will be done.

Mr. Pastor. Wasn't there an effort with this task force to bring all the members on board and also on line so that all of us, all 435 offices would have the most modern technology available and we would all be in sync so that the House would be able to interface with each other?

Mr. Eagen. Absolutely.

Task Force Technological Recommendations

Mr. Pastor. What I am finding though is that when I started 4 years ago I was at the cutting edge, and now I am supposedly behind. And talking with members, they don't even know what the cutting edge is or what is available.

Mr. Eagen. Well, in fairness, the cutting edge keeps moving, very dramatically.

Mr. Pastor. And I understand that and it is very expensive. It keeps moving every 2 years. Did that task force ever come up with a set of guidelines so that a member's office knows that they are, in fact, in compliance with what the House wants to do or what the task force wanted us to do? Is there such a set of guidelines?

Mr. Eagen. There is not a set of guidelines specific to an office. Based on the task force recommendations--Congressman Ehlers was the chairman--a technologist was brought in by the name of Judy Boonstra, who wrote what was called the Boonstra report. It basically had 14 conceptual recommendations for the

House to adopt. Just about every one has been pursued. For instance, it recommended that we go from nine different e-mail systems to one e-mail system. We are there. We have one e-mail system today. In fact, we recently upgraded the software on those servers. It involved the Document Management System that the Clerk mentioned a minute ago as one of those systems.

The issue that you are referring to, office by office by office, however, there are standards that are put in place. Those are evaluated every 6 months and they are upgraded in terms of the technology, the kinds of equipment that the House as a minimum standard will permit offices to buy.

So as time goes on every 6 months we are raising those standards. The Committee on House Administration actually formally adopts those standards. House Information Resources recommends those to the committee and that is one of the efforts to try to keep the members not on the leading edge but so far ahead of the edge to the best of our abilities.

[Questions for Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. The HIR budget is $26.6 million. The Honorable Vern Ehlers headed an information technology task force that has led to a number of improvements in House and member use of personal computers and the Internet. How much of this budget is based on task force findings?

Response. The fiscal year 2000 HIR budget includes requested funding for related task force findings in the amount of $14,570,000. This amount consists of $5,248,000 for non-personnel funds to support many of the ongoing specific recommendations of the information technology task force by providing for equipment, contracts, training, and supplies for the task force in the recommended areas of messaging and scheduling, Internet and Web, security, technical support and House systems, retirement of the mainframe, new technologies, and the administration and operation of those technological projects. HIR requests $9,322,000 for salaries for information technology personnel to support the task related projects.

Question. Given a flavor of your plans to implement these improvements. What projects are not being funded in this budget?

Response. HIR funding which implements and supports the continued sustainment of projects related to the major thematic objectives of the technology task force project related to the major thematic objectives of the technology task force recommendations are outlined in the ten House Support Area in the FY 2000 HIR budget request as follows: Messaging and Scheduling, Internet/Web, Communications, Information Systems Security, Electronic Information Services, House Systems and Technical Support, Year 2000, Mainframe Migration, New Technologies, and HIR Administration and Operations.

In both the Messaging and Internet/Web support areas, the improvements that will be funded by the FY 2000 budget include upgrading the baseline performance of message and web servers. Both of these support areas require performance upgrades in order to keep up with the exponential growth in the demand for mail and web services. In the Electronic Information Services support area, a new web-based user interface for newswire information in being prepared for rollout to Member and

Committee offices. The support and maintenance of this new web-based interface with a robust client-server network behind it is being funded in the FY 2000 budget. The Mainframe Migration support area has seen a great deal of success in implementing task force recommendations for improvement. This project has successfully retired or migrated 83% of applications off the mainframe while simultaneously reducing processing power by 53% and significantly reducing mainframe operating costs and successfully transitioning personnel from mainframe operations to the new client server/network centric architecture. Also, continued funding for site licensing software, video-conferencing and the House communication backbone upgrade are included in this budget request.

Question. As you know, each Member of the House now has a great degree of freedom in the purchase of office computer equipment and software. However, with technology moving so rapidly, what steps have you taken to assist individual offices in these highly expensive systems which are prone to obsolescence?

Response. The CAO staff works closely with the Committee on House Administration staff in proving assistance to Member offices in the purchase of rapidly obsolete computer hardware equipment and related software. The CAO staff assists Member offices in defining their requirements and selecting appropriate systems based upon the standards and software list which are updated and approved by the Committee on House Administration twice a year. Such standards assist Member offices with maximizing the useful life of the purchased hardware, by recommending the level of system, which has a life cycle commensurate with the needs of the office. The software list identifies the most appropriate applications for the functions needed in House offices, and excludes obsolete versions of software. This information is published on the HIR intranet site available through On Line CAO web site.

CAO Technical Support Representatives (TSRs) provide consulting services to encourage House offices to examine their options in the purchase and use of applications software packages. Beginning with the 106th Congress, the CAO restructured the System Integrator agreements to provide the framework by which Members and staff purchase computers and support. These agreements now assign the oversight role relating to computer system acquisition to HIR from the Office Systems Management staff. This new process allows the TSRs to provide advice on equipment purchases and vendor service support plans. TSRs are now required to initial a House office purchase of computer systems and equipment to ensure compliance with House technical standards.

The new Systems Integrator agreement replaces the legacy contracts that provided a subsidy for substandard equipment in House offices. The combination of the new System Integrator Agreement, the Standards for New Purchases list, and the Minimum Standard for Supported Equipment specifications ensures the life cycle of House computer systems is optimized.

For each Congress, the CAO conducts a vendor fair to provide system integrators a forum for offices to be aware of their options for the purchase of the correspondence management software used in a Member office.

The CAO has sponsored a vigorous Member outreach for identifying and encouraging the elimination of non-Y2K compliance equipment. TSRs have sponsored the testing of PCs in Washington and district offices, identified the Y2K failed systems, and participated in retiring failed systems from departing Members of the 105th Congress. The TSRs have held many Y2K education outreach sessions, and have contributed to the success of meeting Y2K compliance for Member and Committee systems in the House of Representatives. The CAO is committed to advancing the capabilities of Member offices, protecting against obsolescence, and preserving the value in expensive systems in the Member's office.

Technological Advances

Mr. Pastor. Are we halfway there in meeting those standards? Are we 90 percent?

Mr. Eagen. There are a couple of different measures. One of the measures would be how many offices are on e-mail. With one exception, all offices are now on e-mail. Another measure would be web sites. We now have 450 web sites in the House. That is a 43 percent increase since the beginning of the 105th Congress. Sixty-six members do not have their own web sites at this point. We have orders for about a third of those to develop those kinds of web sites. So, I think that there has been an enormous amount of progress.

Mr. Pastor. In December I couldn't get any e-mail. How are we going to solve that problem?

Mr. Eagen. One of the implications of the increase in technology in the House is the volume of information that is coming to the House. Let me give you some statistics that I think will paint it for you well.

First, I heard on the radio myself that now 35 percent of American households--and this is at home--are now on the Internet. That is only a third of the country. We are getting a lot of volume of traffic today, but wait until the Internet becomes, like a VCR or telephone. We are just getting started.

In the springtime of last year, we were averaging 80,000 e-mails on the House system a day. At the peak of December--and this is during the impeachment activity--it was up to a million a day.

Mr. Pastor. I know.

Mr. Eagen. On the Internet, HOUSE.GOV, the House's Internet site, we have another Internet site through THOMAS, the Library of Congress, we were averaging in the springtime last year about 10 to 11 million hits or visitors a month. In December we were up to 32 million visitors a month.

Now, for the messaging system, the e-mail system specifically, the subcommittee and the Committee on House Administration fortunately saw that this was coming and funds were appropriated in the end of the last fiscal year to upgrade these various systems.

We were, unfortunately, because of the impeachment proceedings, almost faced with two evils. Do we stick with the old system which we know is really overtaxed or do we rush deployment of a new system? And our experience taught us in the House with new technology that you have to take time to deploy it properly. You have to test it, and rushing it is not always the best answer. But we chose the best of two evils and put the new system in place, all new servers and the top level software that Microsoft provides for e-mail systems, and that is now in place in the House.

Mr. Pastor. Okay.

Mr. Lewis. Good.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and the responses follow:]

Question. Mr. Trandahl, your budget is up by a slight amount: $466,000, or 3%. Is this primarily for salary adjustments?

Response. Yes the adjustment in personnel expenses is directly attributed to the cost of living adjustments for FY 2000. However, the personnel dollar increase is not the full COLA due to other personnel funding reductions taken to offset part of the FY 2000 COLA increase.

Question. Provide an update on Clerk Year 2000 Computer Projects.

Response. Please refer to the table on the following page for Year 2000 Compliance Status of Year 2000 Computer Projects.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Sergeant at Arms

Mr. Taylor. We will take up the Capitol Police budget separately, Mr. Sergeant at Arms. We will see you again at that time and go into questions. And we will, based on what has happened since we last met, be talking about a number of things.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. Bill Livingood, your Sergeant at Arms budget is up slightly (by $311,000). Explain.

Response. The $258,000 increase in personnel costs is due to COLAs, merit increases, and longevity increases.

The $53,000 increase in non-personnel costs can be attributed to a 3.1% rate of inflation. Additionally, an increase in travel is requested to support two Presidential Conventions in August 2000, congressional committee field hearings which pose a security risk, party issues conferences, and offical special events such as funerals. There is also a need to purchase supplies and materials for the new Congress, such as Member and spouse pins, congressional license plates, parking permits, and ID materials.

Question. Please explain the need for three more tour guides.

Response. The Fiscal Year 1999 Legislative Branch Appropriation bill provided for three additional tour guides. At this time, we are not requesting additional tour guides.

Question. Provide an update on Sergeant at Arms Year 2000 Computer Projects.

Response. Please refer to the table on the following page for Year 2000 Compliance Status of Year 2000 Computer Projects.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Dr. Eisold has joined us and I would like to welcome him. This last year I had the pleasure of visiting Dr. Eisold perhaps more than I would like, but it has been enjoyable.

You have a real workload. The police and the pages and the medical surveillance and the managers. Would you like to make a statement first and then we will go into some questions?

Statement of the Attending Physician

Dr. Eisold. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here. And I don't have a prepared statement but I would be happy to entertain any questions that the committee may have.

Mr. Taylor. Are you in good shape with your needs appropriations wise? I know that we have had a lot of things in the last 12 months that were a surprise in the sense that we had more activity, and we are going to be addressing that with the Sergeant at Arms and his budget, and I wondered if you have some comments in that area about needs?

Dr. Eisold. Yes, sir, we did have to make some accommodations in terms of a marginal increase in staff and taking care of some equipment and also information systems which people are talking about here, and also preparations for counterterrorism and the support of the medical side of that issue. We do work closely with Capitol Police and both Sergeants at Arms, in fact, in that regard. So that I think that right now, we have been adequately supported in those requests that have been made.

Mr. Taylor. Well, I would like to commend your staff as well as the police and Sergeant at Arms' staff for that action during that tragedy. I think both of you acted admirably and we are appreciative of your efforts as well as the police force.

Dr. Eisold. Thank you for your comments.

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman, could I ask Dr. Eisold a question?

Mr. Taylor. Certainly.

Preventive Health Measures

Mr. Lewis. Dr. Eisold, a cudgel of mine for a number of years is that, especially among the Members of the House, there are some serious opportunities for preventive kinds of medical efforts and programs. Among other things, from time to time, I have noted that your responsibilities ebb and flow. When the House is in session, probably there is an increase and there may be a lower point in other parts of the year. But having professionals sit around and wait for a heart attack is one thing. It is another thing to be involved actively and aggressively with preventive efforts as well.

To raise the question that I raised a long, long time ago, maybe as many as 15 years ago. Have we ever seriously, in recent years, discussed and is there reason to consider moving perhaps even your location somewhere closer to a physical facility that involves the gym, at least some of your people and coordinating with people's real health situations to improve their condition? I guess that is comprehensive enough that you could respond.

Dr. Eisold. Yes, sir. We have a close relationship actually with the gym, and the gentleman who essentially is the trainer. We do actively participate in trying to identify people with risks and go ahead and tend to their preventive needs.

We are going to be working even more closely, in fact plan perhaps to have a discussion at Hershey with regard to some prevention and preventive measures. But I think that we are completely on board with your thoughts in terms of health promotion, which is something we really try to do on a daily basis, even during the busy times and even during other times when we have a greater chance to spend some time with those sorts of things.

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman, what I am really suggesting here is that there really may be an opportunity here tapping some very fine professionals who are here all the time. I note you are nodding to the staff at the gym, but I must say that that is a long way away from professional oversight regarding health care. I don't know if there is a workup on every member that you deal with in terms of their general health. But how that relates to the gym, it does seem to me that regular exercise applied on a regular basis does interrelate to the quality of work done around the place.

I am sorry that we cannot consider it in terms of the whole staff, our professional staff around here. We tried to work on that some years ago and fell short. But that doesn't mean that it is not a possibility in the offing. I would like to have us have a better idea of what the cost might be to implement a comprehensive preventive health program that addresses the health condition of every member and how that relates to exercise, diet, et cetera.

Dr. Eisold. I would like to reassure you that with every member with whom we come in contact, those are the sort of things that we stress. We stress the diet, exercise, stress management and that is an ongoing, daily routine.

I think that as big an issue would be trying to have everybody pay us a visit, and even when they are healthy, so that we can stress those things because as you can imagine, during the busy session there are a number of people who do not avail themselves of our services. But everybody who comes our way, those are exactly the things that we stress.

Mr. Lewis. I must say that I note how often at the swimming pool there is nobody else there, and I just wonderabout that side of it as well.

Dr. Eisold. If I could get everybody on a good program, I would be very pleased.

Mr. Lewis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Pastor. I can attest, I went down with a headache and before I knew it I was getting a physical. So they do a great job, Mr. Chairman. On occasion, like today, I would have probably been down there with this cold. The office is very professional. And the few times I have been down there they make sure that you are treated in a professional manner and I commend the fine job that you do.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Peterson.

Periodic Screening

Mr. Peterson. Is there any efforts to have periodic screening even for all of us? We put off the annual physicals. But blood pressure, cholesterol and diabetes? In the state where I come from, Pennsylvania, I was chairman of Health and Welfare for 10 years and we routinely had it set up in different public areas to have your blood pressure checked and a couple of pinpricks; you could do all three of those in a few minutes. It was available every quarter and to members and their staffs too. Anybody could go and all morning they were taking blood and doing blood pressures.

Dr. Eisold. If I could, I would like to introduce my administrative assistant, Mr. Burg.

Mr. Burg. That is an excellent question, sir. In addition to the main office in the Capitol, we have a network of seven health units. That is really for the estimated 23,000-plus staffers, we can do those things. We sponsor the House health fair. This will be the third year we have done that in conjunction with the Senate health fair. We bring in George Washington University Hospital and they can do anything from a PSA screening to your cholesterol. This is very popular with the staff and we are interested in doing more, if possible, on an ongoing basis.

Mr. Peterson. Maybe I have been missing it. I haven't been to your office. My first term I have been busy and maybe I didn't allocate my health the time I should have, even though that was an issue that I worked on in the state. If you have places set up in public areas to have your blood pressure checked, diabetes, people do it. And that is an impulse. And oftentimes it was done by an association at almost no cost. They would come in and do it.

Mr. Burg. Additionally, Dr. Eisold brings in the American Academy of Dermatology. Very popular. The interesting thing about it, they actually pick up pathology. We find skin cancers that are lifesaving. These are good ideas and we need to do more of this.

Mr. Taylor. Ms. Granger?

I would commend the health facilities here. At the gym you can have your blood pressure taken and that sort of thing before you get involved, as well as of course going to the doctor's office. In your health fair, we had one with Senator Dole, on what you could eat, and I just followed Strom Thurmond and ate what he ate. I didn't take down any notes. But I followed it all.

We are going to have a small recess for this vote and then we will come back. We have two more areas.

Safety Evaluation

Mr. Lewis. Mr. Chairman, as we go out the door, I haven't had a chance, I may not be able to come back and I would like to mention something relative to Mr. Livingood if I could.

I have read the statement and I know we don't want to complain, but you have been under a lot of stress this last year and I would sure like to see more details regarding both your and the IG's evaluation of safety circumstances. I believe that terrorism is one of the major threats that we face as a country and if there is a target in the world that seems to be a prime target in my mind's eye, it would be the capitol complex.

So the committee would be anxious to hear from you in depth about that, regarding what you see as a threat, whether you are working with the FBI and other agencies. I know of your own background. High priority should be for the House.

Mr. Livingood. At our meeting tomorrow, sir, we would be prepared----

Mr. Lewis. I am not sure I will be able to be here.

Mr. Livingood. If not, I will be happy to meet with the committee or you individually on that. I have to watch somewhat what we say in open session.

Mr. Lewis. Correct.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Lewis raises a valid point and I was in the chair when the shooting occurred, and I can tell you when you are told that an officer is down and they do not have full comprehension yet about what is going on and with the possibilities that we had here with children in the gallery and members on the floor, that is a real challenge. So I look forward to that too.

[Clerk's note.--The following was provided for the record by the Sergeant at Arms:]

The United States Capitol Building is a symbol of the United States recognized throughout the world, and a terrorist operation against it would bring worldwide publicity to the terrorist organization. The FBI has testified before the Senate Committee and stated that the U.S. Capitol is a vulnerable target for terrorism.

At present there is no current credible intelligence to indicate that the United States Capitol is the specific target of a terrorist operation, foreign or domestic.

Usama bin Ladin, who is currently wanted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the American Embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania, has publicly stated that the United States government and its populace are legitimate terrorist targets.

The United States Capitol Police works on a daily basis with the FBI, U.S. Secret Service, and other intelligence and law enforcement agencies on sharing of intelligence information as it relates to the Congress.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. We are going to close this portion of the hearing and then adjourn briefly and come back.

Tuesday, February 2, 1999.

OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

WITNESSES

RICKY SILBERMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
VIRGINIA SEITZ, MEMBER, BOARD OF DIRECTORS
GARY GREEN, GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. Taylor. We are going to go ahead and start, even though we are finishing a vote and we are likely to get called back to the floor.

We will reconvene the meeting and take up the budget submission of the Office of Compliance. This office was established by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

We have today the Executive Director, Mrs. Ricky Silberman, and some of her staff members. There is also a five-member Board of Directors. The Chairman of the Board is Mr. Glenn Nager, a Washington attorney at law, and he cannot be with us, but we do have Ms. Virginia Seitz, the vice chairman.

The fiscal year 1999 appropriations bill provided $2,086,000 to this office. The budget before us is $2,076,000, a reduction of $10,000. The staff level is 17 FTEs and remains unchanged. That is a reduction of two FTEs below the number funded in 1998.

Now, your prepared testimony has been given to the committee, and we can go directly to questions, but I would ask if you would have a statement that you might make in summary or any other comments. It is not necessary, but if you would like, we will go into it.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Ms. Silberman. We are delighted to be here, Mr. Chairman. This is the fourth time we have testified before this Committee.

I wish to also introduce Mr. Gary Green, who is our General Counsel. He enforces OSHA and ADA, and much of the labor-management comes under the aegis of the General Counsel's Office.

I would be delighted to answer any questions that you have, as well as Ms. Seitz and Mr. Green, and we can just go on from there. We are glad to be here.

Mr. Taylor. Any other comments?

Ms. Seitz. No.

Mr. Taylor. We will start with our questions, and I will lead off.

Rate of Employee Injury

You mention in your submission the high rate of injuries experienced by the AOC employees. Can you explain how many injuries, why this is occurring, and is the AOC dealing adequately with the problem?

Ms. Silberman. If you don't mind, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask Mr. Green to answer that question. It is in his purview.

Mr. Taylor. Certainly.

Mr. Green. We take our answer from the figures compiled by the Department of Labor in the Workmen's Compensation Office, which collects the claims, and another office, which analyzes them for the whole Federal government and breaks them down on a per hundred basis from one agency to another.

The Architect's injury rate is the highest in the Federal government. It is a rate of about 10 on a scale of 100. And I must say, before we go further, the injury rate is calculated by reference to lost time injuries. It is only when an employee has been out of work for more than a day that it counts for these purposes. So in the report that the General Counsel's Office filed with the Congress in the last session, we highlighted this as one of the more serious safety and health issues that needed attention. And, in our view, the injuries and the illnesses are a symptom of a general management problem which can be cured by appropriate managerial changes.

The Architect's Office has 2,000 employees. There is a diverse variety of custodial, repair and maintenance and skilled trade tasks. And they can, like any other diverse group, I think, produce better statistics and a lot less suffering. But there has to be, in our opinion, an effort to copy the better practices in similar organizations in the private sector and similar organizations within the Federal government, and that involves a number of steps which we have outlined in our report to the Congress.

Mr. Taylor. For all the members who weren't here, the Office of Compliance was created by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and its primary duties are to resolve employee grievances and unfair labor practices. They conduct health and safetyinspections of the legislative branch buildings and write regulations, provide education and information to agencies and employees about these matters.

You have had almost 3 years experience with our branch of government. How do we stack up as far as these laws and regulations are concerned? And is our compliance record comparable with other employers in the private sector, for instance?

Ms. Silberman. It is hard to compare to the private sector. I think, by and large, the 3-year story of the CAA and the Office of Compliance is a positive one. There was a lot of fear and trepidation in the beginning about the passage of this new law, and that was the reason why there was so much emphasis on education and information.

Insofar as the health and safety and labor and employment laws were made applicable, it seems to us, in general, that Congress is trying very hard to comply with these laws. The numbers show a diminishing number of complaints, and this could be read as evidence of compliance, and I think probably should be read, in certain areas, as evidence of compliance. But in areas such as health and safety, which Mr. Green just addressed, there is more work to be done. There is no doubt about that.

And I would call your attention to the 102(B) report which the CAA requires us to make and in which we looked at laws that had been made applicable and how well the Congress was doing and came to some conclusions about some changes that might be salutary.

Mr. Taylor. We have given the Architect almost every dollar that he has asked for to implement the ADA and any other lifesaving projects that he has identified. Are the congressional buildings satisfactory in safety and especially with the ADA, American Disabilities Act?

Mr. Green. Well, as you probably know, Mr. Chairman, we are required also to do an inspection and report to Congress periodically on that, too. And our report this year finds very good news. The Capitol campus is compliant with ADA and is, I think, probably the most noncontroversial and successful area within our jurisdiction. Complaints are almost zero, and one does not hear objections from those who represent disabled people or from the disabled people themselves.

It is not perfect yet. There is construction going on right now which is designed to improve signage, to improve the clearances in restrooms, certain restrooms, which are still not up to requirements. But between what has already been done--and Congress got an early start on this--but between what has already been done and what is now on the books and in the works, there is a lot to be satisfied about in our degree of compliance with the law.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, would you have any comments? I can go on, but I hesitate to.

Mr. Pastor. You have in your report reasons for employee contacts, and you have about 74 that dealt with title VII. How do you resolve them? Do you investigate them?

Mr. Green. Well, the General Counsel's Office is not involved with investigating those problems with discrimination, but I think our Executive Director can tell you about the procedures we have.

Ms. Silberman. The Act is really divided into two areas. We have a model alternative dispute resolution procedure. We have no investigating authority for the discrimination charges. That is one of the things we have discussed in the report, as to whether or not Congress might want to look and see if that is something that they would want.

Mr. Pastor. What authority do you have, if you don't investigate it?

Ms. Silberman. Our authority was to establish an alternative dispute resolution system, and employees can also come to us requesting information. They get counseling, mediation; and, if their claims are not satisfactorily resolved, we then have a hearing process where I appoint a hearing officer. They have an adjudicative hearing which can then be appealed to the board and go to Federal court. There is no enforcement authority on the discrimination side.

Mr. Pastor. You think it might be a good idea if you did have that?

Ms. Silberman. Our board's report concluded that they thought it would be a very good idea if we did have enforcement authority, and we are specifically asking for enforcement authority in one area which we think is very important, and that is in terms of retaliation.

I don't know whether you noticed in the numbers in one of these reports, but we have very few requests for information about retaliation. But we have a large number, that is 26 out of a possible 70 discrimination law requests for counseling. These are actual complaints in the area of discrimination. We think retaliation is an area in which alternative dispute resolution really doesn't work very well. Because people, once they have filed a complaint, they come back in and they are afraid to go forward with a retaliation complaint.

So I think if there is one area the Congress might want to look to change, that is the most important area, and the board has spoken to that in this report.

Appeals to the Board

Mr. Taylor. Ms. Seitz, the report cites four cases last year. Were these actions publicly disclosed? And can you maybe summarize some of those? That might help what Mr. Pastor was talking about, also.

Ms. Seitz. We decided four appeals from hearing officer decisions, and two of what are called ``R'' cases, that is representation cases, which are disputes before union matters came to election. All of these decisions are publicly available on the office's web site and, of course, in the office's files upon request from anyone.

The four cases actually were a fairly varied diet for us. One of them involved the WARN Act. And in that case, which was called Jarvis Gray v. Office of the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives, the board affirmed the hearing officer decision that notice provided to employees respecting the closing of the House Post Office substantially complied with the notice requirements of the WARN Act.

In a second case, Lawrence Hatcher v. Office of the Architect, the board affirmed the hearing officer's decision dismissing a claim by appellant. He claimed he was transferred in reprisal for filing a complaint of sex discrimination. We agreed with the hearing officer that substantial evidence in the record supported the decision that he was transferred, in fact, because of poor job performance.

A third decision involved the Family and Medical Leave Act. In that case, David Culver v. Office Supply Service, the board affirmed a hearing officer decision dismissing a claim of employment discrimination based both on race and on a failure to comply with the provisions of the Family and Medical Leave Act. We concluded that substantial evidence in the record supported the hearing officer's finding that his employment was terminated by a neutral decision maker, unaware of his race because of repeated failures to comply with an office leave policy. We also concluded that he received adequate notice under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

In the final case, which is Betty Johnson v. Office of the Architect of the Capitol, we found the record supported a hearing officer conclusion that she was not denied a promotion because of her color or religion, and we affirmed the hearing officer decision that preclusion principles barred the relitigation of a sex discrimination claim which she had previously litigated in another jurisdiction.

So each of those cases involved different sections of the act, and those were the four appellate decisions we rendered this year.

In the ``R'' cases, one involved the Senate recording studio, and we issued a decision and order directing a representation election. And in the course of doing that, we resolved questions about whether some employees were or were not supervisors and thus eligible to be part of the bargaining unit.

And a second case, also involving the Senate recording studio, we issued a decision setting aside a representation election on the ground that the employing office had committed objectionable conduct. It had changed the employment terms during the critical period immediately preceding the election, and that interfered with employee free choice in the election; and we ordered a new election.

Those were our six appellate decisions in the course of the year.

Mr. Taylor. Your budget was down $10,000. How did you achieve that? I want to pass that on to the Administration and our Leadership.

Ms. Silberman. Well, each year we have come in here and asked for less money than the year before. Part of that started out with ignorance and not knowing how much we were going to need in the beginning, because we werea brand new organization and nobody really knew what it was going to take to enforce and administer this act.

But we are very proud of the management of the office. And what we have tried to do from the beginning is have a very flexible workforce, each of whom is able to do multiple tasks. And, frankly, we have also had a diminishing caseload, which makes a big difference because our costs for mediators and hearing officers have diminished.

Space and Services at the Library of Congress

Mr. Taylor. Now, you take space at the Library of Congress, I believe.

Ms. Silberman. That's right.

Mr. Taylor. Do you know how much space you have? I think you increased it last year.

Ms. Silberman. Well, we have 6,000 square feet, which we have had really pretty much from the beginning. We did not actually increase it last year. What happened was that we inherited all of our equipment from the Office of Technology Assessment, which went out of business, and we took quite a bit of surplus from them. We were keeping that in a storage space which the Library of Congress was not using, and they decided to use that storage space.

So what we did was consolidate whatever surplus that we really felt that we frequently needed, and we have a 10-by-12 closet close to us for stuff we need all the time for hearings. The rest of it has been sent out to a Library of Congress warehouse.

Mr. Taylor. The Library charges you an administrative charge?

Ms. Silberman. Yes.

Mr. Taylor. And what do you get for that? Is that over and above the space requirements?

Ms. Silberman. Right. They charge us for some financial and personnel work that they do.

Mr. Taylor. The reason I am asking is, I know it is going up $24,000 this year, and I just wondered why.

Ms. Silberman. Well, we wondered why, too. It was going to go up even more than that and we went back to them. They have said that they have done an actual audit of the work they do for us. There was, frankly, some difference of opinion as to how much of that really we thought we ought to be paying. And what we have done is take back some of the work that they were doing and we are trying to do it in house.

But the Library has been absolutely wonderful in terms of their administrative support for us. We wish the costs were not escalating quite so high, but it is very difficult when you have a landlord to be able to effectively negotiate these things, particularly when you are not paying any rent.

Mr. Taylor. Don't look a gift horse in the mouth, I guess.

Ms. Silberman. Exactly.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. It would make it a great deal easier to understand your workload statistics if they added up to the total pending and received. For example, in 1998, there were 6 counseling cases pending at the beginning and 68 received during the course of the year. But only 13 were closed and 5 were left pending a year's end. That begs the question of the disposition of the remaining 56. Can you tell us what happened to them? (In future, please submit tabulations that reconcile all workload cases.)

Response. The 56 proceeded from counseling to the next stage of our alternative dispute resolution procees, and requested mediation.

Occupational Safety and Health

Mr. Taylor. I was looking at the detailees in your justification from the Occupational Safety and Health Agency. What are the duties of those detailees?

Ms. Silberman. Well, we have one, and I am going to let Mr. Green tell you what he is doing. But I would like to say that we have been very fortunate with OSHA in that we have had an unreimbursable detailee from OSHA since we started our OSHA program, and that person has been absolutely indispensable to our being able to run the program. And I hold my breath every year hoping it continues to be unreimbursable, but I am kind of juggling one slot that I am keeping, because there is no way we can do this program without that detailee. We have now had two of them and they are just fantastic, and Gary can tell you what they are doing.

Mr. Green. The detailee's job description is actually called industrial hygienist, which is actually a specialty that requires specialty training and certification. The incumbent, who works directly in my office under my supervision, is an industrial hygienist with a little over 20 years' experience with OSHA.

The job involves the technical side of employee safety and health. He is the person who knows how to test for asbestos or lead containment. He is the person who knows how to walk into a room and inspect it for compliance for electrical safety or for fire safety.

In order to make OSHA work really well, you have to have well trained, experienced people in the law and in the sciences. And when you don't find them both in the sameperson, and you seldom do, what you need is what I have now, which is a good lawyer and a good industrial hygienist.

Mr. Taylor. Moving on to other items, I want to ask about the power plant cooling towers. Now, you mentioned there were certain bacteria there. What action is being taken to eliminate

that problem?
Mr. Green. Well, I will take that question, too, because it was our inspector, our industrial hygienist I mentioned just a moment ago, who tested the water of the power plant and found the Legionella bacteria in high concentrations. The power plant management and the Architect have been very responsive to the hazard, very appreciative of it, and have begun to implement a number of engineering and design controls aimed at preventing a recurrence of this hazard.

It is a specialized area. What is wrong with a power plant or a cooling tower that permits the generation of a lethal level of this kind of bacteria is something not a lot of people know about. From our budget we went out and hired a person who happens to be the recognized national expert on it from the private sector, and the power plant management cooperated in our bringing him in to do a complete inspection and a thorough report with a number of engineering and design control changes over the power plant, which are now being implemented.

As of today, I can't tell you that all of his recommendations are being implemented, but I can tell you that the major ones, to my firsthand knowledge, are being implemented. So that is very encouraging.

Mr. Taylor. Do you have adequate resources and is the AOC doing everything that it needs to be doing to take care of the problem?

Mr. Green. At the moment, I would say that the AOC is making substantial effort, which may very well succeed. And if it doesn't, I am confident that additional measures will be taken. There is no tolerance or casualness about the problem on their side.

Mr. Taylor. Recently, the House Inspector General found several fire safety systems that protect the House complex in a deficient status, and I am emphasizing the ``deficient'' word; that is the IG's word. Have your OSHA and other inspectors validated these findings?

Mr. Green. Well, actually, we made our inspection first and published our findings first. And in many respects they corroborate and----

Mr. Taylor. Before the IG?

Mr. Green. Yes. As a matter of fact, one of the first things the IG did when he put together his inspection team on fire safety was to visit with us and sit through a briefing in which we told him the problems that we had seen based on our inspections, the likely conclusions we were going to put in our biennial report, and the problems we thought he would run into in terms of a divided and sometimes confusing array of jurisdictions here on the Capitol Hill campus.

We haven't seen all of the Inspector General's report. As you know, portions of them have remained private. But I have written for those portions and am attempting to get them for use in my office so that we don't have to go through the same time-consuming inspections that he did again for our purposes.

Ms. Silberman. Unsuccessfully, so far.

Mr. Pastor. Why are they private, Mr. Chairman?

Ms. Silberman. We don't know, but we haven't been able to get it. I just thought I would drop that in there.

Mr. Green. The report just says there are a number of appendices to the part that was released to the public, and those appendices will be kept private. There is no public explanation for it, and our attempts to get it have been--over the telephone and by letter, have not been responded to so far. So I can't shed more light on it.

[Clerk's note.--The following letter was submitted by the Office of Compliance:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Ed and I were just talking. Maybe we can get a meeting with the IG and you folks, and then we can see if we can't see that it is made public; and then you will have an opportunity to address it and act accordingly.

Ms. Silberman. It doesn't have to be made public if it can be shared.

Mr. Taylor. We don't have to do that. I guess when I say ``made public,'' I mean made public to this committee and to your organization.

[Clerk's note.--The following letter for the record was provided by the Office of Compliance:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Pastor. We have the three House buildings. If you had to rate them in terms of OSHA requirements and safety, how do we rate? Because I work here.

Mr. Green. I am going to decline the opportunity to put a number on that, because I don't know how to do that. All I can tell you is that based on our inspections, you are about as safe here as you are going to be anywhere.

Mr. Pastor. Have we met minimum standards? Are we past the minimum standards? These buildings are old; they now probably don't meet some codes in terms of having sprinklers and similar items, or how the electricity or the wires are in place.

I think it is important we know the status of our buildings so that if we need to bring them into compliance, we can do it long-term.

The reason I ask is just for my own information, because you walk through these buildings and you see where there may be some hazards. If you go through the Rayburn and you see wires go down the hallway to connect for a TV interview, you wonder, while these people are wandering here if somebody is injured, what kind of liability are we going to have.

Ms. Silberman. Congressman, 2 years ago I was going to the appropriations hearing, I believe on the Senate side, and I was in a rush. We are all together----

Mr. Pastor. Because you were going to the Senate or just because?

Ms. Silberman. No, no, no. Maybe it was the House side. I can't actually remember. All I know is I walked smack into this huge planter, and I had a gash on my leg. And when they were asking questions about health and safety, I said I thought the compliance, that there was something lacking in the compliance because the Executive Director of the Office of Compliance had sustained a workmen's comp injury.

But in our reports, which you all have--and we will be glad to leave more--generally the House buildings, with the exception of fire and safety, have come out pretty well.

Mr. Pastor. What do you do when we set up a TV room for all the announcers with wires all over the floor and you have the public in the hallways running up and down? You begin to wonder what hazards are we creating, because we don't have adequate outlets for all the cameras.

A couple of times I was worried that somebody might shock themselves by stepping on a wire, because you don't know how well these wires are insulated.

Mr. Taylor. We are going to stipulate that the press is a hazard.

Mr. Pastor. Well, I agree with that, too.

Mr. Green. Next time, Congressman, that you see what you think may be a hazard to employee health and safety, there is my card. I would appreciate hearing from you.

Mr. Pastor. Now, if I call you, can I expect an immediate response, or 2 or 3 days later?

Mr. Green. Immediately, absolutely.

Mr. Pastor. Okay, then I will be calling you, Mr. Green.

Ms. Silberman. You are an ambulance chaser, Mr. Green.

Mr. Green. I was in private practice.

Mr. Taylor. Well, I would like to ask a question just as three friends, Ms. Granger and Mr. Pastor and myself--don't think of us as the committee that holds your financial life in jeopardy--but just about in correcting the cooling towers. Is there any danger from the Legionella bacteria right now, or have we caught it early enough and are we acting on it early enough that we won't have any problems with the program that you have in place?

Mr. Green. Nobody can answer your question with certainty. We do know this: that the growth of Legionella bacteria to levels where it becomes a public health menace depends very much on temperature. During the winter, you don't expect to see an outbreak of Legionella, even from highly concentrated sources. This summer will be another test of the Architect's capacity to implement appropriate design and engineering changes to prevent what happened last summer from happening again.

But until we get the temperature conditions, we can't be sure that the problem is licked. And even then there will have to be continuous monitoring of the water so that we know what is actually going on. And we have a commitment from the Architect that something will happen.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. For the record, please insert all requests and dispositions of transfers and reprogramming made last year.

Response. in FY 1998, no nonexpenditure transfers were requested or made between accounts. The following table lists the expenditure transfers that have made to other agencies for services rendered on the Office's behalf in FY 1998. No funds were reprogrammed between object classes.

Agency Reimbursed	Amount

Library of Congress................................	$48,950
Government Printing Office...........................	8,443
Dep't of Agriculture (National Finance Center).......	6,729
U.S. Postal Service..................................	17,787
General Services Administration......................	26,483
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service...........	14,266

Mr. Taylor. Are there questions? Any others?

Well, thank you very much for your presentation, and we will follow up on some of the items that we have talked about.

Ms. Silberman. Thank you very much. And I just want to say again, as I started to say earlier, one of the reasons we have been able to do what we have been able to do is because we have always had the unstinting help of this committee and staff, and you have just been wonderful from the beginning.

We thank you all.

We have these 102(b) studies, if I can leave them.

Tuesday, February 2, 1999.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH FINANCIAL MANAGERS COUNCIL

WITNESSES

RICHARD BROWN, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, CO-CHAIRMAN
JOHN WEBSTER, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, CO-CHAIRMAN
STUART PREGNALL, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
BETH BROWN, OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE
BRUCE HOLSTEIN, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
JOHN STRAUB, DEPUTY CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
JOHN W. LAINHART IV, OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Taylor. Next we have the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council.

We will now take up the Financial Managers Council, a new entity that was formally recognized in the 1998 fiscal year appropriations bill and repeated in the 1999 bill. Section 307 of the bill authorizes the expenditure of up to $1,500 of participating agency funds to be allocated to the council for administrative needs.

For the benefit of the new members of the subcommittee, I would like to outline the history of this very small council.

In 1996, in consultation with the Appropriations Committee, a group of agency financial officers banded together to form the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council. Their goal is to improve financial management throughout the legislative branch of government.

Such an undertaking is truly needed. The legislative branch does not have an umbrella organization comparable to what the Office of Management and Budget provides for the executive branch. OMB is the President's policy and procedure arm.

In the absence of that function, this subcommittee, together with our Senate counterpart, has attempted to provide a limited amount of policy and procedural guidance. For example, the legislative branch telecommunications effort was instituted under authority enacted in the Legislative

Appropriations Bill. This came after extensive hearings and investigations that were patterned after what the executive branch was contemplating with the Federal telecommunications systems project.

Another endeavor has been the committee urging the use of standardized payroll systems and consolidated administrative service centers, such as the National Finance Center.

In the executive branch, OMB overseas the utilization and implementation of these initiatives. It has fallen to this subcommittee to be the legislative branch impetus for getting the agencies within our funding jurisdiction into these programs.

It is fair to say, though, that our ability to do this is limited. We look with favor on the Council's initiatives.

I would like to welcome the co-chairmen of the Legislative Branch Financial Managers Council, Mr. Richard Brown, General Accounting Office; and Mr. John Webster, Library of Congress. We have your prepared remarks, and I will give you a chance to make a statement, if you so desire, just a summary and then we will go into questions.

Anything you might like to say?

Mr. Brown. I would like to introduce a few of the members here with us today, if we could, please. Stuart Pregnall, from the Architect of the Capitol; Beth Brown, Office of Compliance; Bruce Holstein, Government Printing Office; John Straub, House of Representatives; and John Lainhart, Inspector General's Office, House of Representatives.

Mr. Taylor. Welcome.

Mr. Brown. There is no need for us to say more about the statement. We can insert it in the record and go directly to your questions, if you wish, Mr. Chairman.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

ARCHITECT'S FINANCIAL SYSTEM

Mr. Taylor. We will do that. Last year we asked you to review the plans of the Architect of the Capitol to adapt his internal accounting system so that it would be compliant or compatible with the year 2000 and improve its budgetary controls. Your group cautioned that the end result would be a general ledger accounting system that would not be compliant with Federal standards. As a result, the Architect redirected his efforts to eliminate the noncompliance problems.

Have you followed up to learn how the AOC project is going; and we would like to know if it meets Federal standards.

Mr. Brown. We have followed up with the Architect. They have begun a project to replace their current systems. They have hired a project manager and they are now in the process of evaluating system alternatives.

They have not yet selected a system, so we are not in a position to determine whether or not their new system would be compliant with the standards. It is my understanding that the systems that the Architect is considering have been certified as compliant by the vendors. We will need to work closely with them as they get closer to selecting a system to make some determinations in that regard.

House Payroll System

Mr. Taylor. Recently the Chief Administrative Officer of the House of Representatives has decided to replace our payroll recordkeeping and disbursement system with a modernized version. We are going to do away with the abacus that we have been using.

We know your group has been consulted on this project. What can you tell us about the efforts and how they relate to the goal of standardizing financial systems?

Mr. Webster. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We are working with the House on this very important project. We are helping them analyze the available alternatives.

The selection of a payroll system for the House will be guided by the requirements of the House, and the requirements of the House are somewhat unique. They are more unique than the requirements of the other agencies in the legislative branch. As a result, it will be more difficult to implement a payroll system for the House that may be shared with other agencies because of these unique requirements.

I would like to give one example of a unique House payroll requirement. The House can have, for the same person, five different employment contracts; whereas in another agency, like, for example, the Library, one person can work at five different locations or on five different types of jobs but that person would still only have one employment contract. When this type of unique requirement exists, which is not a normal requirement in most of the vendor payroll systems in the market place, the payroll system will require some customization.

Therefore, the ability of the legislative branch to have a standardized payroll system will become more difficult because of the unique House requirements.

Legislative Branch Standardization of Financial Systems

Mr. Taylor. Well, we were talking about some day, if it is possible, merging all the Legislative Branch systems. Is the direction the House is taking, compatible with that possibility?

Mr. Webster. Yes, it is. In fact, a better example, I think, is the financial system. Right now the House is on an interim financial system which is also the same system used by a number of the other legislative branch agencies. The requirements for the House's financial system are much closer to the requirements of the other legislative branch agencies. There is not as big a difference in requirements.

Therefore, I believe there is a very realistic chance of having a standard system in the finance area. And, in fact, the House, at the last council meeting, presented to the members the idea of working together on requirements for a new financial system. So, I think there is a good chance for a shared central financial system.

The payroll system is another issue because of the unique House requirements.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. Is it realistic for the legislative branch to strive for a common financial management system? What about a consolidated set of financial statements for this entire branch of government?

Response. Yes. The councils goal is to operate an integrated financial management system in the legislative branch. We believe we can achieve this for our financial systems, but it may be more difficult for our payroll systems. Implementation of shared systems is dependent on whether agencies have significant unique requirements that require a separate, unique financial system solution. The legislative branch financial accounting requirements are more common or standard, but payroll rules are not. For example, the House has some unique payroll requirements that would make a shared system very difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. Shared systems would also be dependent on the availability of a host agency to run or a commitment to operate shared systems by legislative agencies.

If legislative branch entities use the federal government's standard general ledger and follow standard guidelines and accounting practices, it would be possible to consolidate financial data for reporting.

Question. What would the benefit be if we were to achieve these objectives?

Response. Achieving the Council's objectives would yield several types of benefits. First, a single consolidated financial statement and audit would save money by reducing audit costs. For example, multiple auditor procurements would be eliminated, the auditors would have a different level of materiality and thus not spend time on the small stuff, and the same auditor would not need to repeat reviews of shared financial systems. Second, shared financial systems would save money by spreading the cost of maintaining the systems among the various agencies and eliminate duplication. Finally, a single consolidated financial statement and audit would contribute to an informed Congress and assure the public that legislative branch assets are being safeguarded, financial results are reported accurately, and laws and regulations are being complied with.

Mr. Pastor. Can I ask something on that?

Mr. Taylor. Sure.

Mr. Pastor. Well, the difference is in the House, I guess, as compared to the rest of the agencies. What does it take to change it? Is there a rule change?

Mr. Webster. I just gave you one instance of a unique requirement, there are others. To eliminate these unique requirements the House would need to change some of its business practices.

Mr. Pastor. But they are doable?

Mr. Webster. You would have to ask the House, but I believe they would be doable, yes.

Mr. Pastor. My staff asked me when are they going to get paid every 2 weeks.

Mr. Webster. That issue is another example of a unique requirement. Most of the other payroll systems are programmed for biweekly pay. In addition, there is no lag-time for the House payroll. In other words, most payroll systems are timekeeping driven, which requires a lag-time of about a week between the end of the pay period and the time the actual paycheck goes out the door. For the House, there is no lag.

If the House went to biweekly pay, a House employee would get half of their pay early and half of their pay a week later. Biweekly pay would require a business practice change.

Mr. Pastor. What has been the historical reason not to change the business practice? I am new to the game, so you will have to bring me up to speed.

Mr. Brown. I don't know the answer to that, Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Webster. From a legislative branch standpoint, it is very important to have common systems. To cite one small example, the House has the same financial system as the Library. And, when the House started to implement the electronic funds transfer (EFT), for their corporate vendor payments, the House was able to use a piece of the Library of Congress software that interfaced with our common financial systems. The House was able to use the Library's software as a starting point which saved time and money.

Mr. Pastor. So it is a business practice in the House for the payroll system?

Mr. Brown. Principally for the payroll system.

Mr. Webster. Right.

Mr. Pastor. Well, I will try to find out.

Mr. Taylor. Other questions? Ms. Granger?

Mr. Pastor. No.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. For the record, please insert all requests and dispositions of transfers and reprogrammings made last year.

Response. Not applicable.

Mr. Taylor. Well, thank you very much for being with us, and we appreciate the work you are doing.

We will meet at 9:30 tomorrow morning and continue our hearings, and the hearing today is adjourned.

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

WITNESSES

HON. JIM SAXTON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

CHRISTOPHER J. FRENZE, CHIEF ECONOMIST TO THE VICE CHAIRMAN

Mr. Taylor. We will call the meeting to order. I know that we are going to have some Members come in later, and Mr. Pastor is on his way.

We are pleased to welcome the former Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, our colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Jim Saxton. Jim chaired the joint committee during the 105th Congress, and he put this budget together. Jim is pinch-hitting today for Senator Connie Mack, who is the incoming Chairman. Senator Mack cannot be with us today, but Jim will very capably represent him, I am sure.

The budget justification material has been printed in Part 1, which has been distributed to the members.

Mr. Chairman, your letter reflects a request of $3.2 million. That is an increase of $104,000 above the current level, and your staffing level will stay at 38.

I would like to see, if you have a statement that you would like to make. I know a formal statement will be placed into the record.

Mr. Saxton. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. It is a pleasure to see you here. I am sure that you will enjoy this assignment, as it is very important, and I know the great job that you did on your previous assignment. I bet it is safe to say that you are glad you are here.

Mr. Taylor. You are right.

Savings from IMF Reform

Mr. Saxton. Mr. Chairman, I will submit my statement for the record. It is a pleasure for me to be here to offer my strong support for the budget that has been submitted for fiscal year 2000. This budget will permit us to continue to do what, I believe, is the high-quality research and the high-quality reports that we have been able to issue for use by Members of Congress and for the public at large.

One of the things that I would like to point out relative to our activities over the past 2 years is that early in the 105th Congress, the Administration submitted a request for an additional $18 billion to be appropriated for use by the International Monetary Fund. That gave us the opportunity to look into the workings of the International Monetary Fund and to explore the stated reasons for its existence and take part in its activities. It also gave us the opportunity to point out some things that we thought that the IMF could do differently, and perhaps operate more effectively so as to accomplish its stated mission.

We pointed out five areas that we thought should be looked at in terms of making some changes. As a matter of fact, two of those areas finally found their way--or a version of our recommendations found its way--into law during the appropriations process.

When we began to study the IMF, we found out that it was a fairly hard organization to study because it operates pretty much under a cloak of secrecy.

We suggested to them over a period of time that they should open their doors and let us look in to see what they are doing with our money. Subsequently, the appropriators decided that would be a good provision to attach to the monies that were ultimately appropriated.

We also noted that the IMF was making loans far below market interest rates. A reformed provision reducing these loan subsidies was attached to the United States appropriation for the International Monetary Fund. We believe that the contribution that we made in that regard was very important. In fact, the basis upon which those changes to the IMF were made originated with the Joint Economic Committee, and the studies that we did, and the recommendations that we made.

Suffice it to say that more changes should be made to the International Monetary Fund, and those changes will be the subject of a fair amount of activity through the committee this year.

JEC Budget Request

We have asked for a modest increase to permit us to continue to put on our staff qualified economists who are very good in helping me and other Members of Congress understand the relatively complicated, sometimes arcane, but extremely important, issues with which we deal. I might add that, working without the JEC, or an organization like the JEC, is in some respects, like walking down a blind alley.

We thank you for the support that this committee has given us in the past, and hope that we will be able to proceed with the modest increase that we have requested.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Do you have the right mix of economists and other expertise on your staff.

JEC Resources

Mr. Saxton. We believe that we have a wide array of economists. For example, when we began to become interested in the International Monetary Fund, we found that we needed someone with background in monetary policy. So we hired someone who had been employed by the Federal Reserve for slightly more than 12 years, Bob Keleher. Bob has been a great help in helping me to understand monetary policy, particularly as it relates to the IMF. I am not sure of the staffing requirements that Senator Mack has set forward. But when we staff up, we try to get a good mix of economists to help us understand those issues which are going to be before us.

Mr. Taylor. I will venture to talk just a moment about the IMF. It is not the subject of this budget itself, but that is something that your committee is working on. I am familiar with it in Russia, and there is a lot of work to be done. I am not as familiar in Asia or Brazil, but a lot of our plans in Russia have probably exacerbated the problem more than helped. There is a wide array of people that would testify on that measure.

Your major product is an analysis of the Economic Report to the President. When will you say that report will be ready?

Mr. Saxton. We have not seen the President's Report yet. It is scheduled to be delivered to Congress, I believe, tomorrow. We are already examining a variety of issues that we expect to be used in the Report, and we will have our analysis of the Report done in a timely fashion. I can't tell you exactly when that will be, but we are just on the verge of beginning that process.

Mr. Taylor. We added about $300,000, I think, in the conference of the Omnibus Bill at the end of last year. How were those funds used?

Mr. Saxton. Those funds were used modestly to expand the size of the staff, and I might say to maintain the quality of the people that we have working for us. Obviously, this is a highly specialized field, and we try to get the best people we can, and we were very pleased to be able to use those monies in that way.

Mr. Taylor. Is there any need for contracting out the economic analysis?

Mr. Saxton. Sometimes it is more effective to contract out. For example, if we decide, or someone requests that the committee look into some very specialized area where you need very specialized expertise, there are two ways that you can get that expertise. You can hire somebody and keep them on staff, or you can find somebody on a contract basis to do a specific study over a relatively short period of time. We have used contracting out from time to time on those types of specialized studies.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We appreciate your work and your report.

Mr. Saxton. My pleasure.

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (GAO)

WITNESSES

DAVID M. WALKER, COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
JAMES F. HINCHMAN, PRINCIPAL ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL
JOAN M. DODARO, ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER GENERAL FOR OPERATIONS
INDIA JENKINS, BUDGET OFFICER

Opening Remarks

Mr. Taylor. We will now take up the budget of the General Accounting Office. The budget request is $389 million and 3,275 FTEs. The funding includes $1.9 million that will be derived from offsetting collections. We have the newly appointed Comptroller General, the Honorable David Walker, and several members of his staff are with you today. Mr. Walker was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. He was sworn in on November 9, 1998.

Welcome, Mr. Comptroller General. We are pleased to have you. Before proceeding, would you care to tell us something about yourself, and then regarding your statement, we will have it entered into the record, and you can summarize it as you best see fit.

Mr. Walker. Thank you.

Joining me today is Jim Hinchman, who is the Principal Assistant Comptroller General, and was the former Acting Comptroller General for the last 2 years; Joan Dodaro, our Assistant Comptroller General for Operations; Dick Brown, who is the Controller for GAO; and India Jenkins, who is our Budget Officer.

It is a pleasure to be here. I am new in the position. It is my third month of a 15-year term, so fortunately I have the ability to take a little longer-term view on things.

My background includes 25-plus years of experience in the public and private sector. I previously ran two federal agencies. I was a trustee of Social Security and Medicare. I was global managing director for Arthur Andersen's human capital practice. I am also a CPA and have a variety of experience at executive management, financial management, human capital strategy, et cetera.

I am pleased to be at GAO. Obviously, as you know, the Congress is our client. We represent your front-line troops in trying to achieve oversight of the executive branch and improving the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of the Federal government. And while our name is the General Accounting Office, it is really a misnomer. Less than 20 percent of our work is about accounting; we are really about accountability.

With regard to our budget request for fiscal year 2000, we are not requesting an FTE increase. Almost all of our budget request, other than 1.9 percent of it, represents mandatories, such as cost of living increases, et cetera. The 1.9 percent represents certain targeted investments in several critical areas outlined in our budget request. I believe these are essential for us to be able to meet the needs of the Congress on a timely basis.

As you probably know, our FTEs and resources have gone down significantly in the last few years. We are down 39 percent on head count. We are down 25 to 30 percent on the budget. But our mandates and congressional requests have gone up significantly, and, as a result we have very little flexibility. In particular, we are in a difficult situation with regard to things like performance rewards, where we are on an uneven playing field with the executive branch. We need to create a level playing field in order to attract and retain the talent that we need to do work for the Congress.

The bottom line, I intend to engage in a comprehensive review of a number of areas in GAO in order to ensure our own economy, efficiency, and effectiveness. I think we have to lead by example. I would respectfully request your support for these modest increases, because I think they are critical for us to be able to get the most out of the resources that we have. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Employee Compensation

Mr. Taylor. Your budget is up $32.2 million. A large part of that, as you said, is going to be for salary adjustments. How does GAO compare with the private sector, and what kind of salary increases does that budget contemplate in order to reach the parities you describe?

Mr. Walker. We are a multidisciplinary professional services organization. In many ways, you can compare us in part to a Big 5 accounting and consulting firm. I have been a partner at Arthur Andersen, and I have been at Price Waterhouse Coopers. We have more diverse skills at GAO. Frankly, we do more important work. The bottom line is that our compensation is just not competitive with the private sector.

Most of the people that join GAO come because they have a deep commitment to public service, want to have a more reasonable quality of life, or other circumstances. Our compensation increases relate to merit pay and cost-of-living increases. Those are the standard increases for the existing level of personnel.

The other thing that I am asking for is to put us on a level playing field with the executive branch. Right now our performance rewards--our awards pool for performance and for results, not just for being there--equate to only one-third of the rewards rates in the executive branch. We have some of the best and brightest people in government. People are always looking to raid the GAO, both from within the government and the private sector. Frankly, we need to be at least on a level playing field with the executive branch with regard to our compensation system.

Performance Recognition

Mr. Taylor. Maybe we ought to cut the executive branch.

You have about $2.5 million in the budget for performance rewards. Can you be a little more specific in how you would award those?

Mr. Walker. Part of that figure would be for executives, and a lot of that would be for nonexecutives. We are going through a strategic planning process right now. We will complete that strategic plan by the end of this fiscal year. We will then make sure that our performance measurement and evaluation systems are aligned with our strategic plan. With this request, we will then have a pool of money that we can use to reward both group performance, which I believe is important in a multidisciplinary organization, as well as individual performance. Awards will be based upon performance results and will be linked with our strategic plan.

Conceptually, that is how we will deal with it, Mr. Chairman. I think it might give you some comfort to know that I had global responsibility for running a human capital services practice where performance measurement rewards were one of the biggest parts of that business. I can assure you that our awards will be based on results and performance.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. Giving awards for work that is demonstrably above and beyond the expectation in a position provides real incentives to the workforce. But many times performance rewards are given for doing a really good job, when a really good job is expected from every employee. Do you have a philosophy on performance rewards that distinguish between those approaches?

Response. A performance awards program must provide a meaningful differentiation in performance and recognize a variety of performances. Performance awards must be based on results and performance, and they must be linked to agency goals and objectives. In a matrix management, professional services organization such as GAO, awards should recognize both individual and team-based performance. Performance awards must be for noteworthy achievements, such as work results, products, or services that substantially contribute to achieving GAO's mission, goals and objectives or providing outstanding service to GAO's internal and external customers, particularly the Congress, as demonstrated by timely, responsive, proactive delivery of high quality information and products.

As I stated, we are implementing a new strategic planning process that will be completed by the end of this fiscal year. The strategic plan will identify, among other things, GAO's goals and objectives for the next 5 years, focusing on specific aspects of our mission and assistance to the Congress. Once that plan is completed, our human capital program, including performance awards practices, will need to be aligned with that strategic plan. Any awards performance must be made based upon how an individual's or team's performance and results contribute to achieving GAO's mission and serving the Congress.

An appropriately designed and absolutely funded performance awards program is critical for a successful human capital strategy. GAO's awards program, however, has not been adequately funded. During GAO's downsizing period, all monetary awards programs were suspended because GAO management concluded it was inappropriate to give out cash awards and conduct a reduction-in-force at the same time. Today, GAO's awards program is less than one-third of what the executive branch spends for its employees. As an employer, GAO has been at a competitive disadvantage and has lost dozens of managers and skilled staff to other federal agencies. GAO's funding of its performance awards program needs to be competitive with the rest of the government in order to help it attract and retain high caliber, skilled staff, particularly at a time when its workforce is aging and increasing percentages of staff are becoming eligible for retirement. The additional funds that GAO is seeking for its performance awards program will also help ``level the playing field'' with the executive branch.

Contract Services

Mr. Taylor. How about for contract services, you have a half million dollars there.

Mr. Walker. We have several requests for contract services. One request is for the human capital area. While we have a lot of bright and talented people within the government, in general my view is that the government needs to pay a lot more time and attention to human capital strategies. I am a big believer that you cannot maximize the performance of any organization without effective human capital strategies. In fact, I am a published author on that topic.

I believe we need to engage in a fundamental reassessment of our human capital strategies, organizational alignment, staffing patterns, number of field offices that we have, performance measurement reward systems, and training programs. A lot of this reassessment can be done by internal people. But I believe it is important to bring in outside experts to team with our people to make sure that we look at best practices within and outside GAO, and make sure that we have adequate capacity to get the job done within a reasonable time frame. We also need to make sure that we look outside the box and not just consider what has been done historically at GAO.

This would be a special purpose request rather than a baseline request. It is something that I believe would result in improvements in our efficiency and flexibility in future years, and, therefore would reduce increases we might need in the future.

Mr. Taylor. I understand that sometimes you get a good look at yourself through someone else's eyes outside your agency, but wouldn't it be better to consult your congressional clients and get the viewpoint from that perspective since they are the ones that you are serving rather than going to an outside expert?

Impact of Legislative Mandates

Mr. Walker. Mr. Chairman, I am glad you mentioned that. It is a great question.

Mr. Taylor. Couldn't you do that with your own staff?

Mr. Walker. I am glad you asked that because priority one, and you can talk with the executives at GAO, is client service. The Congress is our client. I have met with about 30 percent of the Members in the House and Senate so far. I know a number of the Members personally, and I have gotten a lot of feedback already.

We are working diligently to enhance our client satisfaction, to make sure that we get input from our clients before we develop our strategic plan, and to make sure that we get feedback on a recurring basis from our clients as to what we are doing right, what we can do better, and how we can serve them better. So absolutely, positively, we are doing that. We will do that within our existing resources and personnel.

Really what this relates to, Mr. Chairman, is after we complete the client outreach effort, which will continue, and our strategic plan, we will have the needed baseline of information. Then we ask, how are we aligned to meet those needs, and are our performance measurement rewards systems structured to get that done? That is what the funding would be for.

Mr. Taylor. Don't get too enamored with outside consultants, or Congress might decide to eliminate GAO and, when we have a need, get outside consultants.

Mr. Walker. Even though I have been with two outside consulting firms and a global partner with one, I recognize that there are times when consultants can be helpful, but there are certain things that you cannot outsource.

In my view, you have a tremendous amount of institutional memory at GAO. And with the reduction in staff, increasing turnover, and frankly, not as much experience on the Hill, there are not as many people like Ed up here as there used to be. GAO is the Congress's institutional memory to a growing extent, and GAO obviously doesn't have independence problems. GAO also has more disciplines that we can bring to bear on a problem than the private sector can.

So I do believe in using contractors, but I believe in using them when you are looking for additional capacity, when you are looking for selective expertise that you don't have internally, or when you are looking to supplement your resources in a situation where you have a one-time or short-term need.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. Mr. Walker, we have found that outside contractors can be of immense help to GAO in its program evaluations and financial audits. The benefit is that they can be called in; you get a fresh look at problems, and produce a highly professional product. You also need not hire them again if they do not perform well, or if you see a bias in their work. That is so superior to an entrenched bureaucracy. We encourage you to think about utilizing that approach at GAO. You may want to use attrition or some other reengineering technique to generate the funds needed to replace those resources with ad hoc consulting assistance. Do you have any plans along those lines?

Response. As part of the strategic planning process, we are meeting with members of the Congress and committees to identify their needs and areas in which GAO should focus its attention over the next 5 years. Once complete, the strategic plan will determine our needs for core GAO staff and identify areas in which we can supplement staff with contract assistance.

GAO uses contract audit support for a variety of purposes, ranging from data collection and analysis to full-scale reviews. Our largest efforts are in conducting legislatively mandated financial audits. GAO also has been instrumental in encouraging and facilitating the use of public accounting firms by Chief Financial Officers (CFOs) and Inspectors General (IGs) throughout government. In fact, most of the IGs use contractor support for major components of their financial statement audits.

Using contractors makes especially good sense when 1) GAO lacks expertise, 2) there is not enough work in a particular area to justify hiring full time GAO staff, or 3) GAO lacks the capacity to complete work within required timeframes.

Using GAO staff makes especially good sense when 1) GAO's institutional knowledge and experience is important, or 2) using GAO staff would be less expensive then using contract staff.

GAO is trying new approaches to staffing. For example, we have begun hiring staff on term appointments to address bodies of work that do not require permanent staff.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follows:]

Question. Congress seems to be focusing more on outsourcing through GAO for studies and major audits. Is this a good thing for GAO, Congress or the government generally?

Response. GAO uses contract support for a variety of purposes and has been instrumental in encouraging and facilitating the use of public accounting firms by CFOs and IGs throughout government. The determination to outsource work should be made on a case-by-case basis and consider a number of issues. In general, outsourcing should be considered when GAO does not have enough resources or the needed skills to complete the job within the required timeframe. GAO itself will contract for selected skills and personnel in instances when it does not make sense to maintain full time staff in the area (ie, inadequate recurring demand), when we can not attract and retain persons with certain skills (eg, due to compensation limits) or where we need additional human capitol resources to meet a nonrecurring project. At the same time, when GAO is tasked to outsource a study, we provide oversight to ensure the integrity of the audit and evaluation process and the availability of information once the study has been completed.

Work Process Reengineering

Mr. Taylor. Can you tell me about work process reengineering? You have budgeted $500,000 for that.

Mr. Walker. Mr. Chairman, one of the important things that we are doing is to make sure that we are serving our clients well, that we are producing a quality product on a timely basis for a reasonable cost. One of our goals is to look at how we do what we do.

Over half of our resources are dedicated to the issuance of so-called blue cover and other types of reports.

About 5 years ago, GAO engaged in a comprehensive review of its job processes that resulted in some efficiencies. It is time to do that again. It is particularly critical that we do so because we are going to have feedback from the client satisfaction process that we will need to react to. In addition, we are down to where only 4 percent of our audit resources are used for self-initiated jobs; 96 percent of the audit resources used in fiscal year 1998 are either mandates, or they are congressional requests. We need to have more flexibility than that. The only way we are going to get more flexibility with existing resources is to reengineer our processes to try to streamline things while improving the quality and timeliness of what we do.

[Question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. Please provide a list of GAO's mandates.

Response. Attached is a list of outstanding mandates as of February 11, 1999.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. For the record, let's insert all reprogramming requests and dispositions.

Source of GAO Work

Mr. Pastor, do you have any questions?

Mr. Pastor. I have a question. This is my second day on the job, but I have seen where personnel has been downsized. And while you once had a balance with mandated audits and self-initiated audits, now it is being skewed toward almost all mandated audits. Is that due, to the downsizing, or what do you attribute that shift to?

Mr. Walker. Two things. First, reduced resources, reduced head count; second, increasing mandates by the Congress.

We have some graphs in our submission that I would recommend to you. Some are in the material and some we can provide as supplemental information if you desire.

Changing Workload

What you will see is that the legislative mandates have gone up significantly. In addition, our congressional requests are starting to increase, however, we have only a finite amount of resources.

The client comes first. If the Congress says by law or conference report that we have to do something, that is going to be our first priority. If we get a request from a committee or Member of Congress, that is our second priority. So, therefore, by definition, self-initiated work gets squeezed.

GAO needs to have flexibility to do self-initiated work. It needs more than 4 percent. Some of our best work has come from self-initiated work: our high-risk series, which has been critically acclaimed both domestically and internationally; our new performance and accountability series, which we were going to do on our own and then we got a request; the work that we did on S&Ls; and the work that we have done with regard to food safety. A lot of these things--S&Ls in particular--has been some of our best work. This work resulted in saving billions and billions of tax payer dollars.

Realistically, in my opinion, the Congress tends to be focused on more immediate concerns, and that is understandable. But it is critically important that in addition to focusing on short-term concerns, the GAO, with the benefit of my 15-year term and our institutional memory, needs to focus on emerging issues. Though these issues may not be crises today, we need to deal with them and we need to allocate some resources to these issues so we can get that information to Congress so they can act before the issues become crises. So, head count has a lot to do with it.

Self-initiated Work

Mr. Pastor. To the question of work in process reengineering, I am assuming that this is a study that may show that the mandates are so heavy on the time and personnel that the self-initiating reports you may want to do you can't do because you don't have the personnel. You can only fine-tune something so far.

Mr. Walker. Right.

Mr. Pastor. So are you of the philosophy that the self-initiating reports or studies are important enough that you may come back next year and say, we may have to rethink the number of personnel because I maxed out in terms of what I can do?

Mr. Walker. My preliminary view is that about 15 percent of our job reports need to be self-initiated. We need that amount of flexibility. What I would like to be able to do is get these targeted investments, that are not baseline increases, and try to see what we can do to improve the efficiencies of our systems, to see how far toward that 15 percent we can go through maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of the resources that we have. Depending on the results of our review, there may or may not be a need for additional resources. I want to get the most from what we have before I ask for anything else. But that is why these resources are needed.

Mr. Pastor. As I understand your plan, you want consultants and maybe self-analysis so that you can formulate a plan that will take you to the future, the specific plan that you talked about?

Mr. Walker. Yes, the strategic plan is going to be the result of our outreach to the Congress, which is our client, our self-analysis, as well as our outreach to other interested parties that are knowledgeable in areas that we deal with. First the client, second ourselves, and third other sources.

Then what we will do is look at our human capital strategies, and we will make sure that our organizational alignment, our field office structure, the number of issue areas that we have, and our performance measurement/reward systems make sense. That will be done using a team approach with internal personnel and selected outside consultants supplementing them to make sure that we get best practices and are thinking outside the box.

Duration of Self Assessment

Mr. Pastor. What is your time line?

Mr. Walker. I want to be done with the human capital assessment as early as possible next fiscal year. Obviously, we need some funding to get it done. The fiscal year doesn't start until October 1. That means, from the standpoint of the external consultants, we can't do it until October 1. There are a lot of things that we are doing internally right now to be prepared when we get the funds. If we get the funds, we will be prepared for a fast start and get it done probably in 6 months.

Mr. Pastor. So you are talking June of next year?

Mr. Walker. No later than June of next year.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, we could reprogram past budget if we needed the money earlier.

Mr. Pastor. I am trying to get a sense of time, because here we are in February. We are talking about October, and now we are talking about June of the year 2000. So rather than cause you to have to delay the planning effort, maybe that is a solution.

Mr. Walker. If we can get supplemental resources.

Mr. Taylor. No, no. We can't. But we can reprogram and maybe make it up in the next one.

GAO Performance Awards

Mr. Pastor. How are you going to tie in your performance evaluations and bonuses? Are you going to give the bonuses as you are developing a plan?

Mr. Walker. First, we have a modest amount of money for awards now, and people are obviously meritorious of awards. When we get the additional funds, next fiscal year, we will have our strategic plan. We will have looked at our performance measures, and we will have a more objective basis on which to issue awards.

There will be three primary factors for issuing awards primarily to management: Number one, results, quantifiable results, outcomes from the work that we do; second, client satisfaction, and that ties with the client satisfaction process, the outreach process; and third, employee satisfaction.

We are working on client satisfaction. We have started working on our outreach effort. We are working on human capital, but I need some outside help to fill in that human capital dimension to make sure that we can fill that element of the evaluation.

Jim Hinchman has done an excellent job as Acting Comptroller General. If you look at our statistics, GAO has improved its overall productivity despite significant reductions in resources. On the other hand, timeliness as referred to in our statement is based upon when GAO agreed to deliver the work. I think it is more important to define timeliness as when the client needs the work because there may be a gap between those two goals. We have to rethink our measures to make sure that they are focused on the client and make sure what we have been doing is appropriate.

Performance Standards

Mr. Pastor. You currently have performance standards as people are being evaluated. Are your performance standards to demonstrate better performance where they qualified for a bonus, are they being developed internally?

Mr. Walker. It will be a combination. In my opinion, our performance measurement/reward systems do not adequately differentiate performance between individuals. They do not provide adequate feedback to our employees and do not represent enough dispersion in performance among people where you can make meaningful decisions regarding who should get a reward and who should not, and what the difference should be. GAO is better than most Federal agencies. This is a problem that exists in the whole Federal government.

I am committed to make sure that we get our strategic plan updated, we do our client satisfaction surveys; we work on our job process, and our performace measurement/reward systems. We will also link rewards to our strategic plan, and there will be a meaningful differentiation in results and meaningful differentiation in rewards.

By the way, performance rewards are not just money. There are a lot of things that we can do and are doing and more that we could do that are nonmonetary. But, frankly, we have so much wage compression right now, in our SES levels 5 to 8, and next year it is going to include level 4. All levels make the same amount of money, and every year they keep getting squeezed and squeezed and squeezed. If you look at how marketable our people are and that 50 percent of the people in SES are going to be eligible for retirement in 4 years, we are going to have to start doing something or else we are going to have a flight of intellectual capital that is going to hurt the Congress and the country.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follows:]

Question. Nearly 60 percent of your workforce will reach retirement age within 5 years. How do you plan to cope with the threat of an exodus of your institutional memory?

Response. The number and composition of staff eligible for retirement varies each year. In 1999, about 16 percent of our executive staff and 11 percent of the audit and evaluation staff will be retirement eligible. By 2004, about 60 percent of the current executives and 34 percent of the current evaluators will be retirement eligible.

Historical data indicate that all retirement eligible staff will not leave in the first year of eligibility. Additionally, given the average length of service for GAO employees, when those of retirement age leave, a significant reservoir of institutional memory will remain. Importantly, we have hiring plans in place to fill critical areas as needed, and efforts are underway to develop a 5-year strategic plan to establish clear program goals and objectives to help ensure we will be well prepared to continue addressing critical issues in the future. This effort will be complemented by a comprehensive human capital strategy review that will include a skills gap analysis and succession-

planning component.
While the above reference actions will help to reduce our loss of institutional memory, we are likely to experience much higher retirement rates in the future. We believe that it is extremely important that we obtain a reasonable level of performance award, training, and travel funds to help stem this potential exodus. We also believe that action needs to be taken to deal with the increasing wage compression at the executive levels. This increasing wage compression combined with the marketability of GAO professionals and the strong economy serves to place the agency ``at risk''. This risk will increase significantly if the existing wage caps are not raised and modified on a more frequent base.

Mr. Taylor. Are you recommending raising the age of retirement then?
Mr. Walker. No, Mr. Chairman, I am not.
Mr. Pastor. On compression, you have X number of 4s, and now because of seniority they are getting up at the higher grades. Now, is the problem that you don't have enough 5 slots available?
Mr. Walker. No, it is not a matter of that. We have a certain number of SES slots.
Mr. Pastor. What is causing the salary compression?
Mr. Walker. It is because there is a cap on how much SES professinals can make.
Mr. Pastor. Step 10, grade 4, for example?
Mr. Walker. There is a cap on how much SES staff can make, and it is linked to congressional pay.
Mr. Pastor. See, that is good to know. We are helping our employees.
Mr. Walker. There are certain limits on how much a Federal government employee can make in different positions. My point is that those limits have become more and more confining. Many of those limits are tied to congressional pay. As the government moves more towards being performance-based, that will need to change. And I am hopeful, frankly, that the GAO might be able to be a model for the Federal government in the area of being a high-performance organization and that we might move toward being more performance-oriented in how our people get compensated. But I have to work with the Congress to do that. Right now, I am going to work within the confines of what we have.
Mr. Pastor. So your pay or the executive level is linked to the congressional salaries?
Mr. Walker. Yes. To the executive schedule, which is linked to congressional salaries. There is the linkage.
Mr. Taylor. We will see them with signs which say, ``Raise Congress' salaries''.
Mr. Pastor. He will be our best advocate.
Mr. Walker. We are all for you, Congressmen.

Reducing Printing Costs

Mr. Pastor. Have you seen other areas in the agency where you think that you might be able to save money? Maybe the Congressional Record?
Mr. Walker. Printing you mean?

Mr. Pastor. Yes.

Mr. Walker. I am taking a hard look at that area. We have certain constraints. The GPO has a monopoly on certain types of printing. Ironically, we are in a situation where we do 45 percent of our printing in-house because printing is integral to our business. We are a knowledge business. We are an intellectual capital business. Our blue cover reports, et cetera, are our products. We do about 45 percent of our own printing, so we incur the costs, and yet GPO gets 85% of the revenue from the sale of our publications.

Something is wrong there. I am taking a hard look at that to try to find out what, if anything, can be done in the context of current law. Or to the extent that we need somebody to take a look at change, we need to determine what that change might be without setting an adverse precedent for the entire government, because I do believe that GAO is a unique organization. We procure services that GPO does not provide. We contract for distribution of our reports including retrieval and distribution electronically or through microfiche. GPO does not do all that.

And so we have a situation now where we are doing part of our printing, GPO is doing part of it, and outside contractors are doing part of it. We incur the costs, and they get the revenue. So we are, on a priority basis, taking a hard look at that and trying to find out what we can do to economize there or make it more equitable.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Stop revenue to GPO is my third recommendation.

Mr. Walker. Keep revenue for GAO.

Mr. Taylor. I didn't have that part.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follows:]

Question. Given that much government printing work is done by the Defense Automated Printing Service, the National Technical Information Service, and otherwise, and since you do 45 percent of your own printing, how can the Government Printing Office be a monopoly?

Response. While there are limited exceptions, including those granted by the Joint Committee on Printing, the Government Printing Office effectively has a statutory monopoly over printing for the federal government--either by contracting with commercial sources or producing work in-house. GPO also controls distribution, pricing and allocation of revenues for government documents through sales agent contracts. GAO has addressed GPO's printing monopoly in several reports. In 1990, we pointed out that GPO's monopoly-like role in providing printing services perpetuates inefficiency because centralized control permits GPO to be insulated from market forces. As a result of its monopoly, the agency did not have incentives to improve operations and processes that would insure quality services at competitive prices. Government Printing Office: Monopoly-Like Status Contributes to Inefficiency and Ineffectiveness (GAO/GGD-90-107, Sept. 26, 1990). See also Government Printing: Legal and Regulatory Framework is Outdated for New Technological Environment (GAO/NSIAD-94-157, April 15, 1994); and Management Reform: Implementation of the National Performance Review's Recommendations (GAO/OCG-95-1, Dec. 5, 1994).

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wamp, we are delighted to have you with us.

Use of GAO by Congressmen

Mr. Wamp. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to encourage you because this drain in the work force problem is a problem all across the Federal government. I run into it everywhere I go. It is a big problem. Be as proactive as you can there.

I wonder how many Members of Congress really know how to use your organization? On our Interior Subcommittee during the last few years, we have really had the Park Service and other Interior agencies do studies and develop data on how they can better reach their customers and inform their customers. I just wonder more specifically what you are planning so that Members of Congress, particularly newer Members of Congress will know how to use your organization more effectively? Obviously you are going to have to educate a lot of Members of Congress on what you do, how you do it, and why it is a necessary expenditure for this subcommittee.

Mr. Walker. That has a direct bearing on our congressional outreach effort. Under a program that we are designing now as part of our strategic planning, we are reaching out to key staff and Members to get input on our agenda. Our Assistant Comptrollers General and I are meeting with the leadership in the Senate and House over the next few months to try to get their feedback on these issues. We are going to update our communications materials and make them more concise and targeted to try to educate people in this regard.

I have talked to some of my colleagues in the legislative branch, for example, Dan Mulhollan, at CRS, to try to find out what they do and what we can do cooperatively with new Members to try to educate them as to the capabilities of the legislative branch agencies and to provide more integrated solutions. We do a lot of things with CBO where they run the numbers, but we come up with various options. What can we do to team together to communicate and educate new Members?

Many Members use us heavily, and other Members have no idea who we are, and we have a responsibility to reach out to them. The problem is that once we do, we may end up getting more and more requests, and we have a finite amount of resources. We are already down to only 4 percent flexibility for self-initiated work. All the more important to do the kinds of things that we are talking about so when we do this outreach, we don't end up getting a tidal wave that we can't respond to.

One last thing on that. I, along with our executive staff, are working on a set of congressional protocols. I have talked to the leadership in the House and the Senate. Specifically, there is a 10-member commission that came up with candidates for the CG, the Majority and Minority leaders, Ranking and Minority Members of the Governmental Affairs and Government Reform Committee and others, that I am trying to work with to finalize this set of protocols for how we are going to set our priorities, and how we are going to interact with the Congress to try to deal with some of these issues if we do end up getting more demand than we can deal with and make sure that we are focused on the right thing.

Mr. Wamp. In terms of setting priorities as to what you can and cannot do, you will have to say this is the threshold you must meet in order for us to extend our resources in order to

get to the bottom of this?
    Mr. Walker. Right, and to set our priorities. Obviously, if we have a legislative mandate, that is priority one. Congress has spoken as an institution.
    If it is a Chair of a committee, with the Chair comes a responsibility for setting the agenda and a responsibility for leadership. That is a high priority.
    But the Minority has to be able to get some resources. If it is a committee request, it should be higher than a Member request. If it is a Member who is on a relevant committee of jurisdiction, maybe that should be higher priority than a non-Member, but we need to come up with that priority and make it transparent. People don't understand what our priorities are. That is part of the outreach and education process, because basically we are about good government. It shouldn't make any difference who is the Majority and Minority party, GAO's approach ought to be the same, and that is what we are dedicated to do.
    Mr. Wamp. Do you feel right now that very little of your time is wasted? With some of the reports, if you were honest with yourself, would you say, ``We don't have any business doing that?''
    Mr. Walker. We are taking a hard look as part of our congressional protocols and other efforts, at what can be done to make sure that mandates are really in the interest of the Congress and the country; second we are trying to provide incentives for people to think before they ask us to do something; and third, in situations where the work may be a dry hole or where it may not make sense to continue the work, to make sure that we are advising the Member up front so we can cut our losses early. That has to do with job process reengineering and the outreach effort, but I think we have a responsibility to do that.
    Mr. Wamp. Thank you.
    Mr. Taylor. I would hope that you would consult with the Appropriations Committee as part of your consulting because we are responsible for a lot of the requests.
    Mr. Walker. We will.
    [Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

    Question. For the record, insert all reprogramming requests and dispositions.
    Response. There are none to provide.
    Question. Please provide the committee the customary staffing and workforce statistics.
    Response. Insert follows.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

    Mr. Taylor. Thank you. I appreciate your presentation today.
    Mr. Walker. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We will consult with you, I can assure you of that. We know that the person who controls the money is very important in connection with our budget and in other respects as well. Thank you.
    [Question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. Please provide an update on legislative branch Year 2000 (Y2K) efforts.

Response. GAO is currently reviewing the status of legislative branch organizations' programs to address the year 2000 computing issue. We have periodically briefed the Senate and House Appropriations Subcommittees on the Legislative Branch on our ongoing work. Each of the legislative branch organizations have made progress in renovating, validating, and implementing their mission-critical systems. However, the legislative branch still faces challenges in thoroughly testing all mission-critical systems, conducting end-to-end tests of critical core business processes, and developing and testing business continuity and contingency plans.

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WITNESSES

MICHAEL F. DiMARIO, PUBLIC PRINTER
ROBERT T. MANSKER, DEPUTY PUBLIC PRINTER
FRANCIS J. BUCKLEY, JR., SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS
WILLIAM M. GUY, BUDGET OFFICER
CHARLES C. COOK, SR., SUPERINTENDENT, CONGRESSIONAL PRINTING MANAGEMENT DIVISION
ANDREW M. SHERMAN, CONGRESSIONAL, LEGISLATIVE, AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIRECTOR
MARY BETH LAWLER, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PUBLIC PRINTER

Mr. Taylor. We will now consider the fiscal year 2000 budget from the Government Printing Office. We want to welcome Mr. Michael DiMario, the Public Printer, who is with us.

The 2000 budget request totals $128.5 million. There are two appropriation accounts involved: the Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation and the Superintendent of Documents program.

In addition, under the Government Corporation statutes, the appropriation bill authorizes the operation of the GPO revolving fund that finances all printing that flows through GPO. This includes executive and judicial branch printing and printing obtained by GPO from commercial sources for those branches of government.

Although the revolving fund is normally self-sustaining through customer billings and reimbursements, the agency has asked for a $15 million appropriation for the revolving fund for three specific items.

Now, before proceeding, Mr. DiMario, you might like to introduce your staff, the people who are with you.

Mr. DiMario. Immediately to my right is Mr. Francis Buckley, the Superintendent of Documents. We have Mary Beth Lawler, who is an assistant to me; Bob Mansker, our Deputy Public Printer; Andrew Sherman, who is our Congressional and Public Affairs Director; William Guy, who is our Budget Officer; and Charles Cook, who is our Congressional Printing Management Director.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We have entered your full statement in the record and we will let you give us what part of it you desire.

Public Printer's Statement

Mr. DiMario. I have a brief summary of it.

Mr. Taylor. Certainly.

Mr. DiMario. And I will start with our request and thank you for asking us to be here this morning.

As you have noted, we are requesting a total of $128.5 million. The request includes $82.2 million for Congressional Printing and Binding appropriations and $31.2 million for the Superintendent of Documents salaries and expense program. It also includes $15 million for GPO's revolving fund for extraordinary expenses associated with air-conditioning replacement, elevator renovation, and ensuring the year 2000 compliance.

Most of the new funds we are requesting for Congressional Printing and Binding--$5.8 million--are to cover anticipated workload increases. After a period of reduced workload in the 105th Congress, we anticipate a return to workload levels more consistent with historical trends during the 106th Congress.

We are continuing to participate with the House and Senate in the development of new legislative informationsystems that will expand the capability to create and utilize electronic information products in Congress. One objective of these systems is the adoption of Standard Generalized Markup Language, SGML, to permit the submission of machine-readable keystrokes requiring less processing by GPO prior to final production.

The majority of the increase for the Superintendent of Documents, or $1.1 million, is for the Federal Depository Library Program's electronic collection. Managing and expanding this collection is crucial to the objectives of transitioning the depository library program to a more electronic basis. We are requesting an increase in the statutory limitation on travel from $150,000 to $175,000, due primarily to the rising costs of travel.

The request of $15 million for the revolving fund includes $8.1 million for extraordinary expenses required to ensure year 2000 compliance; $6 million for our air-conditioning system, which is in critical need of replacement; and $900,000 for necessary elevator renovations. Without a direct appropriation, financing these unusual capital expenses through the revolving fund will require us to reimburse the fund through rate adjustments. The installation of our air-conditioning system in 1974 was funded by a direct appropriation to the revolving fund, and we request that these extraordinary costs be funded similarly.

Finally, we are requesting an increase in the statutory ceiling on employment of full-time equivalents, or FTEs, to 3,550. We have reduced employment levels by 33 percent over the past decade and by more than 25 percent since 1993. Our employment levels are now dangerously low. Overtime utilization has increased by 11 percent in the last year. Our ability to continue providing mission critical support for Congress is being jeopardized by continued attrition and reductions in our FTE ceiling.

Because of the age of our workforce, we need to replace essential skills. In addition, our expanding electronic mission requires an infusion of new technical skills that are not readily available in-house. We also need additional staffing to fulfill the recommendations of the Booz-Allen & Hamilton, Inc., management audit of GPO. The restoration of our FTE ceiling to 3,550 will provide us with the staffing we need to continue providing essential support for Congress.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my prepared remarks, and I would be pleased to answer any questions you have.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Paper Publications

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

It seems that the country is increasingly accessing information on the Internet; my three boys tell me that. They started with computers, and this is all past my age. When we had the Starr report, there were millions of people accessing it that way before it was ever printed. Is technology leap-frogging the GPO and making paper obsolete?

Mr. DiMario. Well, it is certainly having an impact. I do not believe it is making paper obsolete, and I think the Starr report is an example. We were putting the information up on line and at the same time producing the paper copies so that the Starr report that you were accessing on line was also coming out in print.

The demand for the on-line product was very, very significant, and we could not satisfy that demand. But, at the same time, the demand for the paper copies caused us to go back to reprint on it. It was exceptionally high, and it was exceptionally high not just from the general public but from publishers, republishers of information.

It was an awful lot of information to read on line. People want to download that eventually. And so while you can access it on line, it is a lot more convenient and usable to most people if they can have it in the printed product. And I think that is true of all sizable paper products, by the way. I don't think it is just true of the Starr report.

I think when it gets beyond two or three pages, people want the full paper product, and the demand is there. I think actually Mr. Bill Gates spoke to that issue at one point. He may have used a larger number, something like 20 pages, but it is still not a significant number of pages before it becomes much more useful to get the paper product.

And then you have the issue of not everyone having electronics. To this day, for many, many people, especially in certain rural areas, lower-income people, access to paper products is still needed.

Mr. Taylor. It is hard to take a computer out under a tree and read it, I know.

Mr. DiMario. I would agree with that observation.

Congressional Printing and Binding

Mr. Taylor. You have asked for $82.2 million for Congressional Printing and Binding. To what extent is the $7.7

million increase due to increases in wages and other costs as opposed to workload increases?

Mr. DiMario. About $1.9 million is for increases in salary, mandatory increases, under our collective bargaining agreements, which have been approved by Congress pursuant to law. So those agreements require this increase.

In addition, we have $5.8 million, which is volume increases, anticipated workload increases for this coming Congress. We have done that based on historical data. We have looked at previous even-year Congresses and have estimated the number of pages that we would have to produce in order to satisfy the needs of Congress, and those are pure estimates. They could change from time to time, but this last year, the last 2 years, in fact, were unusually low in volume. So we have moved the figures up based on the historical data that we have.

Mr. Taylor. We are spending over $150,000 per congressman and senator on congressional printing. I would like to ask that $50,000 of mine be put on the Internet, and I have a list of poetry and historical books that you can bind and send to my office. Can we reduce that, do you think?

Mr. DiMario. I think we can, and I think we have.

Mr. Taylor. Without denying us essential information?

Mr. DiMario. We are actually, through increased use of electronics, reducing the prepress cost by about 15 percent in the actual cost of processing electronic input vis-a-vis paper input. And we have realized that cost savings in the past.

When you mention $150,000 per congressman, this is not money that goes directly to each Member's account but takes in the Congressional Record, it takes in all the reports, the committee reports, and all the services we provide for Congress. If you would divide that total figure, or our total Congressional Printing and Binding budget, by the number of Members, I assume that is how you came to the $150,000, that figure would probably be realized. But by moving towards electronics we have essentially been saving money, and we will continue to put forth that effort.

We went into the electronic business in terms of delivery of products, in terms of on-line products, after the passage of the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993. So we are in a relatively new business.

If you will also notice, I took over in 1993. That is a time when I was charged with moving the agency in the electronic arena and especially with respect to the depository distribution program.

We have reduced the size of the agency by some 1,300 employees during that time span. That translates indirectly to savings. So part of that savings is through the enhanced use of the electronics.

And if you look at the historical data, the Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation, you will see that, in terms of nominal dollars, we are essentially flat. Our funding is flat. And at the same time the real cost is about half of what it was in 1979. So we basically have taken the agency's cost base down dramatically, and that is all savings to Congress.

So the answer to your question, in short, is, yes, we can continue to move towards more savings through the use of electronics, but we are not fully there.

Congressional Record

Mr. Taylor. Well, you mentioned, I believe, that you have a projection of an 8,000 page increase in the Congressional Record, which is one of the most expensive programs. That is almost 28 percent. Now, there has been a general decline in that publication over the past several years. What is your basis for this projected increase?

Mr. DiMario. Well, those are actual number of pages, not in the number of distributed copies. The increase is based on the historical estimate of what an even year would cause us to print. So we are estimating more production of pages per product, but the actual volume of distribution has declined dramatically.

As an example, we are down today to under 9,000 copies that are being distributed--8,792 copies. That is down from 17,000 copies just a few years ago. So we have dramatically cut the distribution of the Congressional Record, especially here in the House and especially through the efforts of this committee, and that continues. But the volume of pages, that depends on the amount of work that is done on the floor, in the House and the Senate, and that may vary from year to year. Our anticipation is based on historical data, again.

Mr. Taylor. I was going to ask, and you may not know, how much of the Congressional Record do you think goes into the recycling bins? I know it is not your area, but I was curious.

Mr. DiMario. I have no idea. We don't control the numbers that are distributed, and we assume that the people use it when they receive it. The Daily Record is intended to be a newspaper of the previous day's activities, and I would simply point out how many newspapers go into the recycle bin on a daily basis.

Certainly there are some people who need the Record for a longer period of time, certainly until the bound or permanent Record comes out. Most libraries will retain the Daily Record for an extensive period of time, but many users will look to their immediate needs, and it will be a discard item.

Mr. Taylor. House Members no longer can charge the appropriations for sending copies to constituents. However, the Senate can. What portion of your budget do you think goes to the Senate for their constituents? Do you have a figure?

Mr. DiMario. The cost of the Senate constituent distribution is around $450,000. They are entitled to designate up to 37 copies of the Daily Record to public agencies and institutions. The actual distribution is about 1,800, 1,900, somewhere in that range.

Detailees to Congress

Mr. Taylor. I don't know whether that speaks to the literacy of the Senate or their constituents.

The House committees reimburse the GPO for employees detailed to assist committees in preparing their documents for printing. We continue to appropriate funds for Senate committees on that. How much do you think is in the budget for that?

Mr. DiMario. There is $1.4 million in the budget for Senate details, and we currently have some 24 detailees on the Senate side--23 on day side and one on night side. In addition, we have four details to Senate support offices; and that is two on days and two on nights. And all of that money is charged to Congressional Printing and Binding.

On the House side, we have some 48 details, but they are charged basically to the committees themselves and not out of the CP&B.

Mr. Sherman. The House detail in total is 48.

Mr. DiMario. Excuse me, I was giving you a total number. The House detail is 14; and of that 14, 13 are on days and one on nights. And those people are charged essentially to the committee budgets and not to the Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation.

There are a number of details, six in total, that are to House support offices, and there are five on days and one on nights, and those six details are charged to our Congressional Printing and Binding appropriation.

Mr. Taylor. I have a few more questions but, Mr. Pastor, do you have any?

Year 2000

Mr. Pastor. I have a couple. And one deals, I guess, with the $50 million you are asking for the air conditioning and elevators and I think I read somewhere about $8 million is for the Y2K.

Mr. Mansker. 8.1.

Mr. DiMario. 8.1.

Mr. Pastor. 8.1. In reading your summary, you are now at 90 percent of the critical systems being renovated; and 78 percent has been validated, implemented; and by March of 1999 mission critical applications, you are assuming, will probably be done with the validation. So what is the $8 million for?

Mr. DiMario. Mr. Mansker, who is directing the program, might want to speak to it.

Mr. Pastor. That would be fine.

Mr. Mansker. Congressman, these are extraordinary costs that were not anticipated to come out of the revolving fund, which is used for normal maintenance and operating costs. So they have depleted--these specific Y2K costs have depleted and will continue to deplete the revolving fund so that we will be that much shorter in being able to do the other programs.

Mr. Pastor. Okay, let me make sure I understand it. In March of 1999 you will have pretty much validated your print systems?

Mr. Mansker. We hope.

Mr. Pastor. You hope. Let's say with the professional staff you have, it probably will be there. So the $8 million is basically to replace monies you have already spent on it?

Mr. Mansker. Correct, reimbursement.

Mr. Pastor. How does that work out in the budget?

Mr. Mansker. We came up with that figure primarily at sort of the behest of Senator Bennett last year, who said we are going to have some money for these expenses that you are incurring.

Mr. Pastor. So, basically, you had expended money and you are now looking to replace those monies for the revolving fund. So you do this any time you have a problem, you have a revolving fund you can go to?

Mr. DiMario. Well, the revolving fund is a capitalized fund.

Mr. Pastor. I understand.

Mr. DiMario. As to extraordinary expenses, if you read the language of the revolving fund, it is for operation and maintenance. It is not really geared to sustain expenses for extraordinary activities.

Last year, and I think Mr. Mansker is saying this to you,when we submitted our budget request we did not put in a request for the expenses associated with Y2K. We had some $12 million or what have you. Some of that was sunk costs that we already had, about $4 million, for anticipated projects that we had asked for funding separately under the revolving fund.

When we met with Senator Bennett in that hearing, he raised the issue at the time whether we needed more money. And rather than adjust last year's appropriation request, which we considered doing, we have put it in this year's appropriation request.

Mr. Pastor. Okay, let me understand. In last year's budget, or before October of 1998, when you were doing the 1999 budget, you anticipated you were going to have expenses for the Y2K problem and you put in about $4 million. Did I hear that right?

Mr. DiMario. No, last year, we had the $4 million in for other projects that had to be Y2K compliant, with ongoing expenses that we would have in the system.

Mr. Pastor. That you are expending now.

Mr. DiMario. Right, which we considered to be purely operations and maintenance. And we still consider that to be the case. The $8 million is for money expended for things that are purely being done because of Y2K compliance, not for any other reasons. It is Y2K compliance, and so it is an extraordinary expense. And we are asking for that money for that reason to reimburse the revolving fund, which is for operations and maintenance for money already expended.

Mr. Pastor. So since October of 1998 to October of 1999, have you already spent the $8 million?

Mr. Guy. Most of it has already been spent; and most of the rest of it has already been committed and obligated, in many cases.

Mr. Pastor. So by spending that $8 million, in March of 1999 you hopefully will be validated. That was your cost to solve this problem?

Mr. DiMario. Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor. One of the areas we were talking about was Y2K. A portion of that which is spent, I think it ran over $8 million, is conduced for the Administration. Why should GPO charge the legislative branch of the Congressional Printing Office for that cost? Could you tell us maybe exactly what we are paying for the administrative's portion?

Mr. DiMario. Of the Y2K?

Mr. Taylor. Or if you cannot do it today----

[Clerk's note.--The following information was provided by GPO for the Record.]

The proportion of the $8.1 million requested for Y2K that can be allocated to support of Congress is $2.5 million.

Mr. DiMario. I will have to furnish that to you. We have asked for the $8.1 million, and I am not certain that we have broken it down in that fashion at the moment, but I understand your point. You are suggesting that the system or all systems are used for the benefit of the executive branch and the judicial branch as well and that we should not be charging the full $8.1 million to Congress.

We are treating, of the $15 million that we are requesting for air-conditioning and elevators and the other systems, as ones that are benefiting Congress and others, but they are extraordinary expenses. Our only reason for dealing with this is the view that it is an extraordinary expense based on Y2K, not on which branch of government will support it.

The $4 million, and you will remember before I indicated there was a total of $12 million that we had looked at last year for Y2K, and $4 million of that was, in fact, for items that we had in the pipeline. Obviously, that would be equitably dealt with between the executive branch and the Congress, because it wouldn't be just out of CP&B, it would be out of others.

But in terms of the administrative costs on the $8.1 million, I don't know why, but we will look at it and give you an answer and come back on it.

Mr. Taylor. Appreciate that.

Electronic Processing

Mr. Pastor. This is my second hearing, so you will have to bear with me. It seems that a lot of the core work you used to do has been taken over by other agencies. I heard yesterday that the Clerk's Office is doing more and more, and possibly they are going to request additional resources so they can do additional printing. They seem to think that they are probably at the cutting edge of technology with the electronic transfer.

Although it seems your responsibility is decreasing, you say that you are going to ask for an increase because you anticipate greater costs based on historic requirements. But it is difficult for me to understand the need if more and more agencies are taking business away. Last Congress we weren't requiring as much but yet you are asking for an increase due to historical trends. Somehow, it doesn't gel for me.

Mr. DiMario. Okay. We now receive from the House about 51 percent of copy electronically. In the last 3 years we have received about the same amount, 49 percent, 50 percent, 51 percent.

Charlie, do you have a copy of some of that material we received that you showed me in the hall?

Material, when it comes over electronically, is not validated. It is not verified and validated so that when we put it up on the system we can't automatically pick it up electronically and go with that product. We have to go through and proofread it. We have to go in and correct the problems with it.

If I understand from Mr. Cook correctly, this is material that we received electronically, and these are corrections that are made on that material. And you can take a look at this, and if you think that can go up electronically the way it is, without some human intervention to put it up on line, you have got a different view of the world than I have. We are putting up as much as we can electronically, but it is still not coming over in a quality that can be put up that way and support the needs of the Congress.

We understand the objective of the Clerk's Office, andperhaps the whole House, I don't know, to move the creation of products up to the House itself, and we have been working with people to allow that to happen. We were working in an SGML base structure before other people were. We also have our own system that is an SGML-based system, Micro Comp, that has been in operation for some time. So our capability is greater.

They want to move it up there. To me, it is a duplication of efforts if it replicates capability that is already available in GPO. This issue is something that needs to be carefully examined before it is adopted and funded. We don't think personally that that is necessary. But if that is the view of the Congress that they want to do that, the question is, are you ready to do that now?

I would submit, by just looking at the kind of copy that we receive, that you are not there yet. Now, you can have substantial savings if you move in that direction, and we are not opposed to supporting that effort.

Mr. Pastor. Tell me what I am looking at.

Mr. DiMario. Charlie.

Mr. Cook. That is a Record copy, manuscript copy, that was sent along with the electronic file that Members have time, after they speak on the floor, to go back and revise their remarks. And that is what has happened in that particular case. The examples that you have there are from last September-October, in that time frame. The yellow printouts, or laser proofs, are from the Record that we produced last night.

Now, certainly we are very much appreciative and have worked with the House and the Senate in the acceptance of electronic files. It certainly has helped out efforts to date and it has really enabled us to get the Record out on time on a daily basis now. But there are still areas that we need to improve on, and we try to work with the Clerk's Office and make them aware, and the Official Reporters, of examples like that. Where we are getting the electronic file, however, there are a lot of things that we have to do when we get the hard copy marked like that.

We have to go back in, as Mr. DiMario said, first output the file as a laser proof, carry the marks from the hard copy over to the laser proof, send it back to the keyboard area, correct it, proofread it. And, if there are additional corrections to be made, it has to go back through the system again. So that is all time consuming. Whereas if we could get verified data that wouldn't require those efforts, that would cut down the processing time.

Mr. Pastor. If the Clerk would send you better copy or verified copy, the effectiveness would be there?

Mr. Cook. Yes, sir.

Mr. DiMario. But bear in mind, even when we say 51 percent, we are talking about 49 percent that is still coming over as just manuscript copy. It is not coming electronically. So even if it were all verified at this point, the amount that they are sending over, while it is now comparable to the amount that the Senate is sending over, they are both a little above 50 percent, it is still such that you cannot eliminate the manual process.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. Data preparation charges continue to be the highest cost item, over $12 million for the Record alone. That cost should be declining since much of the data preparation now is done by the House staff before it gets to GPO. Instead of copy, we are sending electronic input in many cases. Why are these costs continuing to grow?

Response. The growth of data preparation costs in FY 2000 is due to the projected increase in the volume of pages. The proportion of pages submitted electronically has been fairly stable during the past two years. Even when data is submitted electronically, GPO has to perform many steps, such as proofreading, keyboarding corrections and submitted changes, and formatting for print and online dissemination.

Question. Have you taken any actions to reduce these costs, particularly the cost of data preparation?

Response. GPO has a long tradition of implementing technology to reduce costs of data preparation. Decades ago, GPO phased out hot metal in favor of electronic photocomposition. GPO created the MicroComp program, which was an industry leading application for many years, to drive the phototypestting system and to allow the same electronic files to be used for multiple purposes. GPO provided early leadership and currently participates in implementation of SGML/XML for congressional publications. This project has the potential to further reduce data preparation costs and to make information more usable. This year, GPO is implementing computer-to-plate technology. We recently reorganized the Electronic Photocomposition and Press Divisions and created a new Digital Prepress section, which eliminated three sections. GPO established an Executive Steering Committee to reduce waste and spoilage and increase recycling. The Booz-Allen recommendations called for expanding staff in critical skill areas and modernizing information systems, which will require some increased cost in the short run.

Question. For the record, provide a tabulation of formats supplied by House and Senate for the daily Record for the past five years.

Response. For FY 98, 52% of the Record was submitted electronically by the House, and 47% by the Senate. For FY 97, 51% of the Record was submitted electronically by the House, and 53% by the Senate. Only incomplete records exist prior to FY 97, but there were significant increases, particularly by the House during FY 96.

Question. One of the major reasons these costs continue to increase is because your costs have not declined to the extent that your workload has declined. The study by Booz-Allen last year confirmed a finding of plant inefficiencies. Since you merely pass on plant costs to your customers in this appropriation, our billings for congressional printing from GPO reflects workload and, to some extent, whatever inefficiencies there are in the plant? Please provide a copy of the annual reports as outlined in the FY 99 Conference Report.

Response. It's useful to recall that the Booz-Allen report found both strengths and weaknesses in GPO's plant printing operations. Some of the strengths include: ``Production has established important information access and dissemination systems and capabilities (p. 4-14); ``The Production Department is implementing industry state-of-art printing technology, computer-to-plate (CTP) to improve quality and throughput and reduce operating costs'' (p. 4-14); ``The Production Department consistently meets a demanding congressional production schedule'' (p. 4-17); ``Representatives in Congressional Printing Management have developed strong and cordial relationships with their contacts within congressional organizations and offices'' (p. 4-17); ``Communication with the congressional customer is frequent and regular'' (p. 4-17); ``Production functions are geared toward rapid and consistent turnout of congressional products'' (p. 4-18); and ``Both Congressional Printing Management and the Production Department are flexible and responsive to changing congressional needs'' (p. 4-18). Weaknesses in plant printing operations were addressed in 13 specific recommendations advanced by the report. GPO is either planning to act, is acting, or has acted on all but two of these recommendations. A copy of the annual report required by the FY 1999 Conference Report is attached.

Billings to Congress for congressional work reflect the costs of producing that work by GPO, including maintenance of available staffing, equipment, paper, and other necessary resources in order to be prepared to respond to any congressional requirement, at any time it arises. GPO's accounting systems for developing and reporting congressional printing and information product costs have consistently been approved by GAO and GAO-contractor audits. GPO, under the direction of the JCP, the Appropriations Committees, and its legislative oversight committees, has consistently worked to minimize costs to Congress for it printing and information products, and over time has been very successful in achieving this objective. Adjusted for inflation, congressional printing costs have declined by more than one-half in the past twenty years (see p. I-2, GPO Budget Justification, FY 2000). We are continuing in our efforts to reduce the costs for producing the work required by Congress in the discharge of its constitutional functions.

Report follows:

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

BUYOUT AUTHORITY

Mr. Pastor. In your presentation you talked about how employees have been with you for a number of years. Maybe they don't have the skills that are now being required in terms of electronic transfer and the new technology that we have and so you may find yourselves with an aging workforce that is not as skilled.

Last year, you were given the buyout. Now, how have you used that to improve the skills or to adjust to the new technology?

Mr. DiMario. I have not used the buyout. Number one, the way the buyout was structured, we had an early out and a buyout both in there. The early out was totally self-operating. Anyone that wanted to go, who was eligible, could go. That is the way the language read, and we had it verified through counsel's office. There was no selective process I could use in deciding who could go into an early-out program. We put that in place immediately to see how many people we would have leave.

At the same time, the demands inside have been very strong on me to get more people into the pipeline. Last year, if you recall, we asked for a level number of people, that the statutory base that you had given us be left in place and not reduced. Congress, nevertheless, reduced that number. In my judgment, we were getting very close to a dangerous level then. We have since lost a lot of people.

By using the buyout procedure, we have so many people who are eligible for a buyout right now, I was afraid that we would have a landslide of people going out the door. And even though it is structured in a more selective way, it is very difficult to apply it selectively. I can't afford to have all these people go out the door and perform the duties for the Congress. And I just can't let it go. If you want that, you might as well close the place, and you won't get your products.

Mr. Pastor. No, I don't want that. I want you to have the people that are skilled so you can do your job. I am trying to find a way.

Mr. DiMario. If you read the language for the buyout last year, it says, essentially, if you are facing a RIF, but we weren't facing a RIF. We had already reduced below the numbers that Congress had asked us to reach. But we are in the opposite situation. We just can't afford to let all this experience go out the door and not have some training program to bring some more people back.

Mr. Pastor. Let me ask about the training program. Is that available to you in terms that allow you enough flexibility to retrain the people that you have in place who would like to learn a new skill. Where are we on that?

Mr. DiMario. I think from your perspective, yes, you would allow us enough flexibilities. I am not certain the Civil Service law will necessarily allow us as much flexibility as we would like in order to cross-train people from different crafts to the crafts that we need. We are always having some people who are in skills that, because of changing technology, the skills become obsolete, if you would, and there are other technologies where the skills are in high demand.

Right now, the demand is for IT professionals, information technology professionals. Everyone wants them. It is very difficult to retain those people. And to train people in, let's say take someone who is in another craft and move him over to that, we can do it, but it is difficult under Civil Service laws. And it is also something that within the unions we have to work out an equitable scheme that allows the people to be treated fairly.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Taylor. Mr. Hoyer is with us, and it is always good to see you, sir. Do you have any questions? We are going to move on to the Superintendent of Documents next.
Mr. Hoyer. I have a few questions, if I might, Mr. Chairman.
Mr. Taylor. Yes, sir.

FTE'S

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you very much. I apologize for being late. I had another committee meeting.
Mr. DiMario, welcome to the committee. Nice to see you again.
What are the FTEs currently at the GPO?
Mr. DiMario. I think our current FTE level is at----
Mr. Guy. 3,383 is the current ceiling.
Mr. DiMario [continuing]. 3,341. But these are employment figures. These are actual on-boards.
Mr. Hoyer. 3,341. And the ceiling is 3,383?
Mr. DiMario. I believe so.
Mr. Guy. That is correct.
Mr. Hoyer. And you are asking for 167 additional to take you to 3,550. I am not going to take the time now, but I want to go into why that is necessary because, obviously, that is going to be a contentious item both in the committee and on the floor.
Mr. DiMario. Yes, sir.

COPY REQUIREMENTS

Mr. Hoyer. Let me ask you some specific questions. Who controls the numbers of copies and publications that GPO prints for Congress? Do we do that or do you?
Mr. DiMario. You do.
Mr. Hoyer. So that you really don't have control over the demand in terms of the numbers of copies?
Mr. DiMario. That is correct.

INTERNET

Mr. Hoyer. Let me ask you something about the Internet, because we hear a lot about it. I have been over there, I have seen your operation, but perhaps you can explain to the committee, if you have not already done so--if you have already done that, I will pass--about the electronic presence of GPO and how heavily is your web site used. And do your electronic efforts support other web sites?
Mr. DiMario. Okay, we have not gone into that.
Mr. Hoyer. Well, I think it is important to do that because I think there are some Members who have the old concept of GPO as just printing documents. And there are a whole lot of people who understand that we are no longer communicating only this way but also doing it on the Internet and doing it electronically. And I think it is important for the committee to understand how up-to-date you are in terms of that mode of communication.

Mr. DiMario. Every product that we prepare is prepared with an electronic database--the ones that we do internally in GPO, not everything that we buy. And the bulk of what we require is through purchase.

Of those products that we prepare in-house, and some other products that we have, some 70 databases that are up on line, governmentwide databases, The U.S. Code, as an example, is a data bases and we have that fully up on line. The Federal Register is up on line. The Congressional Record is up on line. So there are some 70 major databases that we have.

There are some 45,000 separate publications that are up on line. There is quite a number. Of that, we have between 10 and 15 million, I believe it is in my prepared statement, that are downloaded from that GPO Access system, from that on-line system, from the Internet, if you would, every month. That is a monthly download of 10 to 15 million documents, on an average. It is very, very substantial.

The American public uses it.

STARR REPORT

Mr. Hoyer. Let me ask you something about the Starr report. You did an extraordinary job within our tight time constraints.

Mr. DiMario. Our workforce did an extraordinary job.

Mr. Hoyer. I meant that.

Mr. DiMario. But thank you, sir.

Mr. Hoyer. What kind of reaction have you gotten from the Judiciary Committee and others?

Mr. DiMario. The Chairman of the Judiciary Committee sent an extraordinarily kind letter, a very, very positive letter for the work that we did. And, in fact, I received another letter within the last few days from Chairman Hyde and naming a specific individual with respect to the work and activity. I have received a similar letter from the Senate within the last couple of days, the Assistant Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Chairman, I have other questions, but I know I was late and you want to move on, so I will submit those for the record.

Mr. Taylor. That will be fine.

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you, Mr. DiMario.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

ELECTRONIC FORMATS

Mr. Taylor. We have the Superintendent of Documents, Mr. Francis Buckley, with us; and the budget for the Superintendent of Documents is $31.2 million. The largest item is for the depository program, $26.8 million.

A lot of your publications are now in electronic form also. How much has that saved you, do you think, in your area?

Mr. Buckley. Well, we have been transferring our funding from the printing and binding of materials to the actual cost of disseminating the electronic materials, so that we have had a cost transference within our program budget for the last several years. But, as you can see from this year's request, we have reached the point where we need to ask for some additional funding to manage this process.

We are now at the point in our transition to electronic information dissemination where we are mounting and putting up into GPO Access as many publications as we are sending out. The last 3 months it has been 50 percent each. So we are moving very steadily along in this transitional mode, but the cost for cataloguing and indexing these titles still remains because we have to provide locator services to identify them even on line.

The cost to organize the information, to prepare it for mounting, in some cases, has to be borne. And that is done on the production side of GPO. This whole process is a very integrated one within the whole agency. But, beyond that, we are looking at the ongoing cost of maintaining this information available.

In the traditional print environment, we sent the documents out to libraries, and they could retain them long term. Now we have the only copies of information up on our servers, and we have to continually maintain that. We are seeing an accumulation of electronic information that we have to maintain readily accessible to people, and that process means that we have some increased costs as we look at ongoing, long-term access to this information.

Mr. Taylor. Do you have the authority to solely make materials for depository libraries--I have two in our district--available on Internet or CD and not actually send them the printed material?

Mr. Buckley. Yes, where electronic formats are available and satisfy user needs as well as other requirements, such as for permanent availability. This whole transition is going on in conjunction with agency publishing plans and the evolving capability of the library community. And agencies more and more are moving to only creating their information in electronic format, on CD or, more often now, on line. So that is the only version for the information, and we have authority to acquire that and to distribute it.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. The budget for the Superintendent of Documents is $31.2 million. The largest item is for the depository program, $26.8 million. A lot of your publications are not in electronic format: CD-ROM, Internet, Access, and so forth. How much has that saved your program?

Response. Through FY 1999, GPO's electronic dissemination initiatives have been in large part funded by savings in the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP) related to the reduced numbers of tangible products (paper and microfiche) distributed to the libraries.

It is difficult to quantify savings due to the use of electronic information technologies. Clearly some cost savings are realized in the initial publication and dissemination stages of the product life cycle. The FDLP Electronic Collection already contains some 140,000 titles, including links to over 45,000 titles on agency Web sites. Many of these titles would not otherwise be available to the FDLP. If these additional 45,000 agency titles were delivered to users in ink-on-paper, the cost would be about $12.4 million above the current level of funding.

However, the ongoing costs of providing permanent public access to electronic information cannot be estimated. In the traditional print products environment these costs were borne by the depository libraries, but with online electronic publishing the costs of permanent access fall to the Government. Congress' historical commitment to keeping Government information available to the American people results in increased funding and more technical staff skills for an increasingly electronic FDLP. GPO's FY 2000 request for the S&E appropriation includes for the first time an increase of approximately $1 million which is directly related to collecting more electronic publications and to the longer-term costs and added complexities of providing permanent access to the electronic publications in the FDLP Electronic Collection.

Question. Do you have the authority to solely make materials for depository libraries available on the Internet or CD and not actually send them printed copies?

Response. Under section 1914 of Title 44, GPO has the authority, with the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing, to determine the most appropriate and cost-effective distribution medium for products distributed to depository libraries. Our approach to carrying out this authority is to make such decisions based on discussions with the depository library community and taking into account the needs of users. In our discussions with the library community it is clear that the success of the transition to a more electronic FDLP is incumbent upon the Government's ability to guarantee permanent access to the electronic versions.

Title 44

Mr. Taylor. Last year the much advertised revision of Title 44 failed to be enacted into law. Are you asking that we revisit that this year? And, if so, will that have any impact on your depository budget?

Mr. Buckley. If is a big word.

Mr. DiMario. We are not asking anyone to specifically revisit the Title 44 proposals of last year. That was in S. 2288 that the Senate was attempting. We do have recommended changes to Title 44.

Now, most of them do affect the documents side, the depository side, and we have submitted these in the past to Congress. We think they would enhance the program, the statute, and would gladly send you a copy of what we previously submitted.

But at this point in time we have entertained no thoughts to seeking out sponsorship of a specific change to Title 44. It was so problematic last year that we need to think about things pretty heavily. But the recommendations I will send you are recommendations that we have looked at and we believe would enhance the ability to provide electronic services.

Mr. Taylor. Well, what committees are considering the changes?

Mr. DiMario. Last year, the committee that was considering it was on the Senate side. It was Senate Rules and Administration under Senator Warner and Senator Ford as the Ranking Member. The bill was passed out of committee in the very, very last days of the session. It was never considered on the floor of the Senate and never taken up in the House at all.

Normally, if a bill were to come up this session, it would come out of House Administration. And in previous years bills have emanated from House Administration, but I have not received any indication from Mr. Thomas, the Chairman of that committee, or from anyone else that there is a bill being considered.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. We are going to be considering this afternoon in the House Administration Committee the projected work for the committee, and the issue of GPO will be on the committee's agenda.

But I might say, Mr. Chairman, we eliminated the Joint Committee on Printing on the premise that Title 44 reform was going to pass, a premise that I thought was questionable at best. But the committee, in its wisdom, decided to do that at the request of Mr. Thomas.

We are proceeding to some degree as if the Title 44 reform had actually passed; the staff of the Joint Committee on Printing has been eliminated. So it is an interesting situation in which we find ourselves, but the reality is the Joint Committee on Printing has been effectively shut down although we never passed the legislation to do that in an orderly and comprehensive way.

Mr. DiMario. May I address that? In S. 2288 there were a number of authorities that, under the existing statute, belonged to the Joint Committee on Printing that were being downloaded to the Public Printer. Without an existing committee, we are sitting with sort of a legal dilemma as to the way those statutes ought to be carried out.

The outgoing Chairman, Senator Warner, sent me a letter suggesting that certain things should be carried out by me as Public Printer and, to a degree, I am using that letter as an authority to move forward. But at this point, I don't know whether Mr. Thomas shares those views. And I think that some of the difficulties are downloading statutory responsibilities by letter to the Public Printer, letter of the Chairman, and not by action of the full committee or by statute itself. So there are some difficulties with that.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Chairman, that is an interesting legal situation. I wouldn't want to argue that in court.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, do you have any more questions?

Mr. Pastor. I have none.

Mr. Taylor. For the record, then, we will insert all the report and documents submitted to the committee; and if there are no other questions.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. For the record, insert all reprogramming documents submitted to and received from the Committee.

Response. No reprogramming requests were submitted.

Mr. Taylor. Ms. Granger, we have just had the GPO, and do you have any questions?

Ms. Granger. No.

Mr. Taylor. Okay. Thank you. We will recess now until 1:30 when the Architect of the Capitol will appear.

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

WITNESSES

ALAN M. HANTMAN, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
HERB FRANKLIN, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT
ROBERT MILEY, SUPERINTENDENT, HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS
AMITA POOLE, SUPERVISING ENGINEER, CAPITOL BUILDING
STUART PREGNALL, BUDGET OFFICER
JACK BOERTLEIN, ASSISTANT BUDGET OFFICER
HECTOR SUAREZ, DIRECTOR, HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT DIVISION
LYNNE THEISS, EXECUTIVE OFFICER
MICHAEL G. TURNBULL, ASSISTANT ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL
DAN HANLON, CHIEF ENGINEER
BILL ALLEN, HISTORIAN

Mr. Taylor. The committee will come back to order after our lunch break. We will have Mr. Archer who will come in and interrupt the meeting perhaps, but we want to start with the Architect of the Capitol.

We are taking up the fiscal year 2000 budget for the Architect of the Capitol. We have Mr. Alan Hantman, the Architect of the Capitol, who is making his third appearance before the committee. We welcome you.

Before we get into the hearing, can you introduce your staff and give a few figures about the budget that we will take up today.

Mr. Hantman. First of all, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I truly look forward to continuing to build a strong relationship with this subcommittee under your leadership and continue to work in an open, professional and a very constructive way.

Sitting to my right is Stuart Pregnall, our budget officer, and to his right is Lynne Theiss, our executive officer. And we have a cast of thousands in the back row. Herb Franklin is our administrative assistant and Dan Hanlon, who is our chief engineer. Our new assistant architect is Michael Turnbull. Jack Boertlein is the assistant budget officer. Amita Poole is the superintendent basically of the Capitol Building and Bob Miley, superintendent of the House office buildings.

Mr. Taylor. Who is your curator?

Mr. Hantman. We have a curator, and she reports to Herb Franklin.

Mr. Taylor. Who is your best historian?

Mr. Hantman. Bill Allen is our historian. He in fact is writing a new book updating the entire history of the Capitol, and it is due for publication soon.

Mr. Taylor. Good. Funds may be contingent whether he wins in a shoot-off with me later in the Capitol on who finds the most insignificant fact.

Mr. Hantman. Okay. He has a wealth of insignificant facts.

Mr. Taylor. Things like John Paul Jones' bust is over in the Senate. He is wearing two medals, and can he name both of them?

Opening Statement

Mr. Hantman. You may have him on that.

The budget presented to you today, Mr. Chairman, really talks about numbers, and it also talks about the agency in and of itself. This is an agency that is in transition. Today marks two full years since I assumed the position of Architect of the Capitol, February 3rd, 2 years ago. And again, a lot of changes are needed, a lot of changes have occurred and I am very proud of what we have accomplished over these years.

In addition to the budget information in the statement, there is an appendix on life safety issues, appendix B on security, another appendix on the Architect of the Capitol Human Resources Act, the Congressional Accountability Act and labor relations. All of these issues are very important to the agency, how we build and support the needs of the Congress over the coming years.

We also have an appendix on re-engineering, a program which we have worked on with this committee before and on capital projects itself.

We have increases in Capitol projects this year, minor, lower level increases in the operating costs, and we can certainly talk about specifics in that and the rationale for that as we go through the hearing.

[Clerk's note.--The statement of Alan M. Hantman, AIA, Architect of the Capitol, follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. The estimates are around $215.9 million and 1400 FTEs. My challenge to your historian comes from a love that I have for the Capitol, and we entrust you with a major responsibility, you and your staff.

The 16 acres of area here are visited by people from all over the world, and certainly we encourage the children and adults who come here, especially the children that come here to learn history and be a part of it, both today and see what happened over our 200-year history, and I support the efforts that have been made in the last 2 years.

VISITOR CENTER

I certainly support the funding for the Visitor Center that we have discussed for some time. I served on this committee 4 years ago, 1993 and 1994, and I was interested in it at that time, and I will certainly be working with our leadership and the minority leadership to see that this comes about. Mr. Pastor and I both share that and support the project.

The budget for the Architect of the Capitol is a reduction of almost $31 million below last year. That is primarily because of the additional $100 million Visitor Center project that we funded in the Omnibus bill. Can you give us an update on the Visitor Center and how long it will take to complete the necessary plans and updates before we will be able to break ground?

Mr. Hantman. There was some hundred million dollars of midyear money meant to be supplemented by private funds, and we have approximately $25 million in the preservation kitty at this point in time as well. Each milestone of the project needs to be reviewed and approved, as we understand it, by some 6 different committees. So a big part of any schedule that we have will be based on how long it takes to get approval at each step of the project.

Initially our mission is to be coming before this Appropriations Committee and the matching Appropriations Committee on the Senate side to talk about the first phase of the work, which is really our mission, to go back and take a look at the 1995 plan, which was developed over a period from 1989, as I understand it, and to revalidate all of the components of that plan. That would include the sizes of the spaces, the support facilities within the spaces, in fact the location of the Visitor Center, whether the East Front is in fact the best location for it.

Clearly things such as security concerns need to be addressed more thoroughly than the 1995 plan. So revisiting it in that context certainly makes an awful lot of sense.

We have been working with the General Accounting Office to define a scope of work so we can come to you and to the Senate to talk about what magnitude of dollars we need to draw down in the first instance to begin this evaluation. We basically don't have any money at this point in time to do any work other than begin to define the first phase of work, which is the validation phase.

So we have been working with the General Accounting Office and we have a conceptual listing of elements that we need to flesh out more with them before we come to you with an estimate of what the costs might be to study these issues. Location, of course, the access policy, who gets screened and how, sizing of the facility, whether visitors are allowed to back flow into the facility once they tour the Capitol. The cafeteria size, gift shop, how many auditoriums, should we be excavating the proposed additional expansion space next to the visitor facility. 163,000 square feet are currently shown as unprogrammed space basically to accommodate needs that the Capitol might have. My sense is that the Capitol does have needs for support spaces, which don't need to be in the primary building but could be in an adjacent center, buffer groups, other functions. Certainly the police can be pulled out.

We need to look at those needs and get some input from leadership in terms of what that might be all about. How cars and trucks and VIPs come and visit them, we need to validate that issue.

Security, the outside light, utility issues, all of these things need to be revisited. So the concept is once we present to you this scope for the updating of the plan and the validation of the plan, it can take a year and a half for us to come up with a report on this working with all of the folks in the Capitol as well as the General Accounting Office and consultants, bring consultant teams on, working with them to do this work.

Again, once that report is submitted, how long it takes for us to get approval on that before we go into the basic design phases will have to be determined. I can't control the approval process, and once again if 6 different committees are involved in the approval process, no matter how much I enjoy testifying, 6 committees could take quite a bit of time. So that may need to be addressed up front. What happens if committee A and committee B agree with the entire plan and approve it, but the third committee disagrees with component X and the fourth disagrees with component Y, how do we get consensus among 6 committees to be able to move forward at all. That needs to be worked out as well.

So once we get the design phase done--approval on the first phase, we expect that another 18 months would be needed for full, and we would try to condense the engineering and design phase into one. We really don't think that engineering and design are separate. They are fully integrated. That is probably an 18-month period until we come back for further approval. Then construction documents, and after that period of time we estimated the 1995 plan for a 3\1/2\- to 4-year construction time frame.

So if you start adding all of those together, we might not be breaking ground until 2003 or so.

Mr. Taylor. In other words, I would be premature to expect the dedication to be in December?

Mr. Hantman. I think so, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. It has been my observation that government will mess up a one-car funeral; and having to operate inside government on this important project is a necessary task, I suppose, but the schedule you are laying out, I would think the House and the American people would want that limited and sped up a lot, because what happens if you start with $100 million? In fact, we were talking about $100 million being more than enough to do it, and now we are up to 125-plus and the longer we take to do the project, the more money it is going to take and the chance that the future Congresses may run out of patience, and if you raise money to complete the project, with inflation it may be a never ending task.

Mr. Hantman. We agree with you, Mr. Chairman.

[Clerk's note.--Subsequent to the hearing, the following correspondence was received:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

VISITOR CENTER APPROVAL PROCESS

Mr. Taylor. Now if you as a professional will put your attention toward being able to do the joint engineering and architectural plans to move that as expeditiously as possible, I will get with Mr. Pastor and perhaps our joint leaderships and see what we can do to cut through the bureaucracy. Perhaps we can have joint meetings with the Senate and maybe put together leadership from both sides of the aisle to meet together rather than having you meet every time with 6 different committees and have to go back through 6 different committees and so forth. We will do what we can do to speed that up as fast as is prudent.

We are going to hear more about security later on today--the Sergeant at Arms will talk about security, and we are all concerned about security--but the American people deserve the right to enter their Capitol, and it would be a tragic event if we curtail that drastically. You will never have total security in a democracy, and those of us who represent the people in this body and in this building will always be at risk, and we ought to assume that that is part of the job. So I think we can be prudent with security, but I wouldn't want it focused on as the primary result of any efforts we have in the Capitol. I think we should focus on the purpose of the Capitol, the people's right to come in and observe and to learn historically and to attend meetings, in either House or the committees, and we will have to do the best we can on security. But as I say, we will never be totally secure in a democracy.

VISITOR CENTER SECURITY

Mr. Hantman. I am heartened to hear you say that because I fully concur. The concept of a Visitor Center certainly has a strong security component to it, but basically we are also trying to welcome our visitors, to make their visits more pleasant than they are now. People will be jostling each other in the Capitol today without knowing what they are seeing and not being able to hear the people next to them. Conceptually if they come to the Visitor Center, they will be able to hear the history and look up the voting records perhaps of their representatives, to be able to learn about American history. All of these components would have to be planned into the Visitor Center, along with the amenities such as bathroom facilities and dining facilities.

Mr. Taylor. I would hope that could be done simultaneously. You could be designing the schedule and doing the architectural design while we are working with the committees to go forth because there will be a number of things that will be standard that will fit any program.

Mr. Hantman. We welcome an opportunity to meet with you and the committee members to talk about the issues. If we come down to a basic validation of where we are with the 1995 plan, I think we could move a lot more quickly than in the outline.

VISITOR CENTER EXHIBITS

Mr. Taylor. Who would be handling your historical side in the plan that you put together? I understand what you are saying. I often thought that history is taught by osmosis. When you walk around, for instance, the old Supreme Court Building without knowing anything about it, all of the history is supposed to jump from the chairs into those minds that walk by it, and I haven't found that too reliable. It helps to have some understanding before you get there, and that of course is what you are talking about.

Who would be designing the program in that area?

Mr. Hantman. One of our concepts which we can share in more detail and flesh it out, we probably need a blue ribbon panel of noted historians on a nonpartisan basis to talk about what is the story that wants to be told to the visitors that come to the Capitol. These are people in private practice, whether historians or with a real knowledge of what the legislative branch of our government is all about. Perhaps 3 people to come together with approval from the House and the Senate to help define the philosophy and the theme of what the exhibits are all about. That information would have to be done fairly early on, parallel to the shell we are designing to enclose that information. So I agree, we certainly could be working in

parallel on that.
Mr. Taylor. We have the artifacts that we have.
Mr. Hantman. We have access to wonderful artifacts.
Mr. Taylor. That will limit to some extent what you show.
Mr. Hantman. Right.
Mr. Taylor. Let me sum up by saying that we will try to get together and do what we can to cut back on the bureaucracy, getting everyone's opinion, but doing it as quickly as we can if you will work on the technical side.
Mr. Hantman. Absolutely.
Mr. Taylor. Before I go on with other questions, Mr. Pastor, do you have any questions?

VISITOR CENTER REVALIDATE 1995 PLAN

Mr. Pastor. On the subject of the Visitor Center, do we have to revalidate the 95 plans?
Mr. Hantman. Correct. The first bite of the hundred million dollars would go towards an outline proposal to begin that validation process.
Mr. Pastor. So part of that hundred million would be used for that?
Mr. Hantman. We would be coming to this committee and the matching committee on the Senate side, I think it is just the Appropriations Committee that takes a look at this first bite of the hundred million. With this plan for validation, we would be able to bring the consultants on to revisit where we are specifically, revalidate it and change it as necessary.
Mr. Pastor. And the time line may be a year and a half?
Mr. Hantman. It depends on how quickly we move. It could be a year and a half. Talking with GAO, they thought that was not an unreasonable time frame.
Mr. Pastor. An issue of concern with the Visitor Center in the past has been parking. Is that off the table? For the visitors' cars, VIP cars and all of the buses. The Union Square idea hasn't floated very well, but is that something that we are going to be looking at again?
Mr. Hantman. We would certainly be looking at the bus flow and the way that it works right now. Neither the Capitol nor the Supreme Court appreciates the fact that First Street is sometimes buses two deep. It could remain a drop-off location because the Visitor Center is still oriented to be on axis to East Capitol Street.
One of the alternatives to do with the buses is lot number 6, which is under the highway to the south, is a very large, very close-in lot currently controlled by the District of Columbia. Congress used to control that lot. If we were to get control of that, and administratively we say discharge your passengers, go to lot 6 or go over to Union Station, without idling on local streets. When your tour group comes back out, you would be called and your bus comes back and picks you up perhaps on the West Front. So we are looking at possibly coming in from the East Front, going up and ending your tour in the Grand Rotunda with the most magnificent space in the building and exiting down looking towards the Mall towards the west. This is one of the concepts. So the buses waiting for passengers would no longer be on First Street, they would be on

that circle on that West Front. That is one of the concepts we are looking at. Certainly the buses should not be idling in neighborhoods. These are some of the bus control issues that we have talked about.

We have had meetings with the District of Columbia, with the Capitol Police, with local police, with people from the local communities while talking about traffic control and bus control. We have made some inroads regarding parking and access and egress from Union Station.

But in terms of regular car parking, the only issue that we have been addressing thus far is how comfortably can we eliminate parking from the East Front plaza. There used to be hundreds and hundreds of cars out there. Basically it is now just leadership cars, and we need to talk the level of parking and what is needed on the House side and the Senate side and what alternative solutions there may be for that.

Mr. Pastor. Let me go back, of that hundred million, you said the first bite comes to validate the 1995 plan. How much money is that? What is your ballpark figure?

Mr. Hantman. We had requested about a year and a half ago when the Secretary of the Senate was I think the executive officer for the commission that was looking into this, the joint House and Senate commission, an amount of about $5 million be made available for studies and consultants. That is what we are looking into right now, to see how valid that is and how the General Accounting Office agrees or disagrees with that number and what we need to accomplish with that first phase.

Mr. Pastor. $5 million?

Mr. Hantman. That is what we were talking about, the philosophy of the blue ribbon panel, all of these issues were rolled up into that.

Mr. Pastor. Engineering, after we validate the plan, about a year and a half?

Mr. Hantman. Again, it depends. I said that; and it also depends on whether or not the existing plan gets modified or we are starting from ground zero. We might be able to cut that down if in fact it is the existing Visitor Center and we are looking at modifications to it.

Mr. Pastor. So I heard you say in the first phase of looking at the plan, we may say that it doesn't work and we have to start over? Is that a possibility? I want to make sure that I heard you right.

Mr. Hantman. The conference report that accompanied the hundred million dollar bill called for a thorough review. It directed that the Architect of the Capitol may not expend any funds without an obligation plan approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations. But the thorough review has to encompass location, existing facility, uses of every space in that facility, justification that we are doing what needs to be done and not excess. All of the components really need to be revisited.

Mr. Pastor. It could be possible that you may say that the 1995 plan is not worth implementing?

Mr. Hantman. That is possible, but frankly I think----

Mr. Pastor. What is that probability?

Mr. Hantman. Looking at it, there are a lot of things that made a lot of good sense relative to how the Capitol relates to it, improving the flow of people from the House side to the Senate side, the issue of underground deliveries serving both sides of the Capitol. A lot of good thinking went into it. I would be surprised if the base of that plan did not prove to be very sensible.

Mr. Pastor. What is your ballpark figure for the engineering cost? You have estimated $5 million for the first phase.

Mr. Hantman. Engineering costs could be calculated in many ways. It is often a percentage of the construction costs.

Mr. Pastor. What have you estimated?

Mr. Hantman. I don't have a breakdown on that right here, sir. Depending on the nature of the project, I think we have spent some $2.8 million on the project--$2.55 million to get to the 1995 plan. There are some other issues, steam tunnels that need to come in, and certainly the interior design was not addressed. So that is what was spent on the project to date. How much modification we need to do, designing security systems to go into that. That is where we would be starting from.

Mr. Pastor. You are an architect?

Mr. Hantman. I am.

Mr. Pastor. Usually architects can give you ballpark figures as they make their bids. What would you estimate would be reasonable?

Mr. Hantman. If you are talking about a hundred million dollar facility, I would think that your percentage rate for something like that would be in the range of 6 percent, plus or minus, which would be for a hundred million, $6 million.

Mr. Taylor. Does that count the $2.55 million?

Mr. Hantman. It depends whether you are starting all over again. And then we would have to go into the interior design, exhibit design and other design issues, so it is not simply base building or core design.

Visitor Center Private Sector Funds

Mr. Pastor. People may think that they have $100 million and that it is enough money to do everything that you need to do to validate the plan, engineer it, design it and then move dirt. So I guess what I am trying to get to is that we can look at the hundred million which has been appropriated, but how realistic are we that it is not going to need to be increased? That is why I am trying to get ballpark figures so at least in my mind I have a better understanding of what needs to be done and what is an expectation that is more realistic than just throwing a hundred million at you and saying thank you.

Mr. Hantman. In earlier discussions we were talking about matching funds coming from the private sector, and the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House were mandated to put together a program essentially to match that hundred million if that magnitude of money is necessary.

Mr. Pastor. How much money do we have in match in the private sector?

Mr. Hantman. $25 million right now, which was raised from minting of the commemorative coins and things of that nature.

Stuart makes a good point. The Capitol Preservation

Commission has that money, but they have not formally dedicated it to the Visitor Center. We have talked about that money in those terms.

Mr. Pastor. Is it realistic that we are going to get the match? Is it a 1 for 1 match that we are looking at?

Mr. Hantman. Potentially that has been talked about. The issue of the scope is yet to be determined. For instance, there is 163,000 square feet of unprogrammed space that we talked about earlier. Does that get built?

My sense is that there are a lot of needs that the Capitol has relative to giving leadership more flexibility in terms of who sits in the Capitol and who supports the Capitol in adjacent spaces.

There are other issues to look at such as the Capitol Police Control Command Center might appropriately go there. Recording studios for the House and the Senate need to be upgraded.

While you are digging the big hole on the East Front, when you are talking about the cost of excavation per square foot, it is significantly less than if you wanted to do that project alone. So it is an opportunity to look at other needs that Congress may have and see if that can be comfortably accommodated in this area.

Another issue is whether or not the 500-seat auditorium that is currently in the plan originally requested by the Library of Congress is something that Congress believes we really need, for Congress or the Library. Whether or not a tunnel to the Library of Congress for $10 million is something that we want to do. All of these issues will be discussed and validated.

Visitor Center Timeline

Mr. Pastor. Just taking your time lines that you gave us, we are about 9 years away from opening this center.

Mr. Hantman. If we are eliminating some of the bureaucracy, easily a couple of years can be lopped off that.

Mr. Taylor. I think that is our challenge to get with the joint leadership and see what we can do to meet the concerns but at the same time cut the time because you are going to cut the costs. The longer we drag this out, the more it is going to cost in the end.

Mr. Pastor. You basically have 6 bosses that if they meet you will be happy, but when they do meet they may not agree which would cause some problems.

Mr. Hantman. Right. Stuart clarified a point. When I indicated this committee and the matching committee on the Senate side would appropriate the first phase of funds, that is true, but the 6 committees would have to approve that plan before we came to you for the money.

So yes, how review and approval proceeds is, I think, critical to whether this project moves at all.

Mr. Taylor. I would love to discuss with you any thoughts on what we might do about cutting this.

Mr. Pastor. Mr. Chairman, I went through the briefing papers, and I read some editorials from people saying build it. Then they said get it done. I think there is a lot of demand that we have this Visitor Center functioning, and I think it is incumbent upon us to get the 6 committees together and give some direction, otherwise the first part of the validating of the 1995 plan will never get done. I believe that with your leadership, we may be able to do something.

Mr. Taylor. It might be that we get the leadership from both sides and each of the committees to form some sort of group to meet with the Architect rather than having him go to 6 committees. If we do a central meeting each time, that would save a lot of time. There are things like that that we could probably do.

Mr. Pastor. As members of some of these committees we may have to put our ego aside and work with each other. We can only lay the blame so many times on the Architect of the Capitol, and at some point we have to assume some of the responsibility.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. For the record, supply the latest cost estimates, construction schedule, and the conceptual layout of the Visitor Center.

Response. The most recent ``official'' cost estimate is based on the 1995 plan; it is now four years old. That plan, which will be reviewed as described below, called for the construction of a 532,389 square foot facility. It included 226,805 square feet for the visitor center itself, 57,069 square feet for Capitol support services areas, a 57,939 square foot auditorium for the Library of Congress, a 27,621 square foot service tunnel and 162,955 square feet for future expansion. The estimate for that work assumed a June 1998 construction midpoint and totaled $95 million. The estimate included the cost of the CVC shell and core, all exterior improvements for the East Plaza, and allowances for all interior finishes for the CVC proper. The 1995 plan estimate did not, however, include interior fit-up and exhibit costs and their associated design costs, enhanced security provision, the tunnel to the Library of Congress or the CVC connection to the existing steam and chilled water system on 2nd Street which also needs to be addressed. Thus, the 1995 plan estimate would need to be increased to cover these additional scope items, other scope changes identified through the review process, the design, interior finishes and fit out of the future expansion area if desired, and also by approximately three percent annually to a new construction mid point to cover inflation.

With respect to the construction schedule, pursuant to directives in H. Rept. 105-825, the Conference Report accompanying the fiscal year 1999 Omnibus Appropriations Act, we are currently preparing a proposal and obligation plan to present to the Appropriations Committees, as well as others, for the planning phase of the project. This will be the ``thorough review'' of the project called for by the Conference Report. The office is working with GAO in the drafting of this obligation plan so that their participation in this phase can be meaningful. This plan will be presented to the Committees in March, and will anticipate an 18-month planning phase that will be comprehensive in scope.

Upon completion of the planning phase a new revised plan for the project will be presented for review and approval by the House Appropriations Committee, House Administration Committee, House Transportation Committee, Senate Appropriations Committee, Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, and (presumably) the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works. There is no way to assess how much time would be entailed in such review and approval process.

If the plan is approved, another obligation plan for the next phase--engineering and design--would be presented to the Appropriations Committees for approval. The engineering and design phases would necessarily be combined and might require up to an additional 18 months of work depending upon the extent of revisions to the 1995 plan required in the approved plan.

It would seem prudent to allow a period of 8 months to be consumed by review and approval processes, which would schedule the beginning of construction at approximately 44 months from March 1999, or December 2002. Construction would take approximately 3\1/2\ to 4 years. Certain ``fast tracking'' techniques will be explored in the planning phase to determine whether this schedule can be accelerated.

In 1998 a preliminary cost re-assessment, done as an order-of-magnitude allowance projection without the benefit of a schematic design, raised the cost estimate to $160 million. This resulted from allowances for security enhancements, exhibit design, interior fit-up and other considerations as noted above. This is not a hard cost estimate. The upcoming review of the CVC will establish the conceptual baseline for the scope of the project from which a more accurate preliminary cost projection can be made.

Security

Mr. Taylor. Ms. Granger?

Ms. Granger. In light of the shooting last year at the Capitol, have you reevaluated the security or is that being addressed through the establishment of the Visitor Center?

Mr. Hantman. The concept is that 95 percent of the visitors that come to the Capitol should be flowing through the Visitor Center. That was the concept, but again never signed off by leadership. We have so many doors right now. Part of our Capitol Police budget accounts for 4 officers at doors where visitors come through, 3 officers at doors where staff and members come through. And if visitors are allowed to come through every one of those doors, their job becomes much more difficult, and basically the visitors are not oriented and welcomed the way that they should be.

So the original plan did take into account having magnetometers remote from the Capitol itself by several hundred feet towards East Capitol Street and everybody coming through there would be screened and once through that area, they could choose to take self-guided tours and go up through the Capitol itself or wait for a tour guide. They could see a film which oriented them to what they were going to see, other exhibits based on the history of our country and the way that our government does business. All of those issues.

So you are perfectly right, it is meant to enhance the experience of the visitor and security was always a part of that, but the issue relative to the shootings is that we probably have to look at the security and, with the chairman's comments in mind, still make it a very welcoming experience but a secure one as well.

Fire and Life Safety

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Hoyer.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Hantman, welcome. On the subject of fire safety, can you bring us up to date? The Inspector General described our system as deficient. As you may know, before your time here there was a fire in Jim Wright's Longworth office. Curt Weldon, a member from Pennsylvania, raised the issue of fire safety. He and I have co-chaired the Fire Service Caucus and are concerned. Significant steps were taken in Longworth and other places, but can you tell me what the plans are?

Mr. Hantman. First of all, let me state I welcome the IG report. Anything that helps Congress focus on life safety and facilitates our ability to accelerate the program and get required funding for it is welcomed.

Appendix A of your report, sir, has a report on life safety in terms of what we are doing. We have reorganized a special group under Lynne Theiss, our executive officer, specifically to address life safety issues, among others.

We have requested funding in life safety projects to the extent of $16 million in this year. We have brought on consultants as early as 1997 to work on various subprojects for us, such as doors. Many of the doors in the Capitol complex--in fact in the Capitol building itself, there were virtually no doors on the West Front that had panic hardware and that swung in the right direction, with alarms on them for security purposes. Thus far we have completed 7 door renovations in the Capitol and now we will start on the House side. All of the parts have been fabricated so we will have minimum disruptions. We have another 33 or 40 that have been completed, another 18 under design. We have outside firms that are coming in to help us. They are working with the Corps of Engineers and other government agencies to support our capabilities and move the project along.

What we really do need is to be able to sit down and talk about accessibility, for instance. A prime concern is in the Capitol. Most of the work that we have been able to accomplish relative to life safety and security issues in any occupied space is during a break. It is when people are out in August or November or December come around and people are not there. That has been a very limiting factor in terms of our being able to accelerate the work in the Capitol.

Mr. Hoyer. Regarding the problem on the South Door, there is some concern about notice that that was going to be done. Are you aware of that? Was there any notice to the Members of Congress?

Mr. Hantman. Notice had been sent out.

Ms. Poole. The Sergeant at Arms is getting ready to send notices out once we are ready to proceed.

Mr. Hoyer. The South Door is closed now, is it not?

Ms. Poole. No, sir. It is still open.

Mr. Hoyer. I know Mr. Thomas talked to me about some concerns that he had with the South Door.

Mr. Hantman. So, we are addressing in the design phase many aspects of life safety and security. We meet regularly with the Sergeant at Arms of the House and Senate to plan methodologies. We need to meet with leadership to talk about accessibility for major committees and leadership offices, as well, so we can get in there and chase walls, put in fire detectors and conduits and the alarms and sprinkler systems. All of that needs to be done. That certainly is the major positive aspect of the IG report to help focus on that.

Mr. Hoyer. In terms of a time line, do we have one, realizing the problems that you have about access that the House and the Senate has to operate while you are doing this, but do we have a time line?

Mr. Hantman. Each component of the life safety program is different. We have been trying in the Capitol to coordinate our work with the CAO so we go into a room once. They put in the telecommunications and we put in life safety and the member comes back in and there is no further damage. Do you have an answer?

Ms. Poole. The Capitol building, the entire basement in the Capitol building has been upgraded and we do have the smoke detectors in the testing phase right now in the basement, and that is the backbone of the entire fire alarm system.

A lot of the major areas in the House, and the House is further along than the Senate, we are about 30 percent complete going through the major areas.

However, we have lead paint in the building. We are having to comply with the standards of proper hazardous material abatement which takes from 8 to 12 weeks per room.

Mr. Hoyer. I don't want to cut you short, but my colleagues want to ask questions.

Is there a time line? In other words, do you have an expected time when the deficiencies will be corrected and the Capitol complex will be considered meeting fire safety codes?

Mr. Hantman. We have some 13 million square feet up here on the Capitol and as you know, the Congressional Compliance Act of 1995 kind of changed the ground rules. So we have a lot of catchup to do. There are so many variables relative to this that it is tough to give you a number. We can come back to you with an analysis building by building, assuming an approval process, assuming dollars are there and assuming that we have access.

Mr. Hoyer. If you don't have a time line, you will never get there. That is my point. I understand that all of us waste time. We have disagreements with one another and we hold you up, and that is our fault and that is what Mr. Pastor was talking about. But if we don't have a time line it will not be accomplished.

The House is ahead because of Curt Weldon, because he raised that and he said we are going to do this. So we got about the business of doing it. And Vic Fazio as chairman and Jerry Lewis as ranking member made it happen.

My suggestion to you is that this is a critical problem. As you know, we had a fire in Longworth last year and some of the fire fighters and some of our police got people out of the building. The alarm system did not work properly. So we need to get our buildings safe both for those folks who work here and for those who visit us.

Mr. Hantman. Most of the life safety systems do have time lines, but we have to organize it by building to give the overall picture and show where the holes are so we can more clearly explain that.

Mr. Hoyer. I think the committee would be interested.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. How much is in this budget for fire safety? Are the budgeted items responsive to the IG's analysis?

Response. The AOC Fiscal Year 2000 budget request (excluding the Senate Office Buildings) consists of 23 projects identified, which require funding in the area of fire safety.

House	11	$4,057,000
Capitol	5	2,170,000
Library of Congress	7	1,115,000
Total	23	7,342,000

It should be noted that our total request in this group is $9,792,000 as one project's funding request in the RHOB has both the installation of sprinklers as well as the installation of the telecommunications cable tray system. The original request for the Rayburn Building included only the sprinkler portion of the request. The table above includes only fire sprinkler costs.

Nine of these 23 projects will require multi-year funding for completion. The estimated out year requests for these is $6,135,000 and are outlined in the Five Year Capital Budget.

There is one project which is in design at the present time, Install Emergency Signs, Lighting, and Safety Areas, that is planned for fiscal year 2001 funding, which is valued at approximately $2,000,000.

Annual funds totaling $360,000 are requested in the fiscal year 2000 budget to accomplish the inspection, testing and maintenance of the existing fire protection systems in the Capitol, House and Library Buildings. Based on present analysis by contractors, we are evaluating the sufficiency of this projected level of support.

None of the above projects are in response to the HOIG report. However, we have used the report to determine that there are an additional 15 funding requests that will be needed to provide an even more comprehensive program within the House complex.

The additional funding requests will be needed to: Install systems after they are designed by outside vendors--rather than the previous method of using in-house forces to install as time allows, funds to expand the areas of coverage for sprinkler systems in the Cannon Building to cover special height spacing such as the Rotunda space as well as the Caucus Room and the rooms above and below the Caucus Room, funds to expand the areas of coverage for sprinkler systems in the Longworth Building--to cover the basement areas that have not been renovated to date, the Ways and Means Assembly room, lobby and adjacent corridor, and all the committee rooms, as well as funds to be included in the infrastructure study of the Capitol to provide for the integrated design of a sprinkler system and its installation.

The current conceptual estimate pending design and construction documents for these projects is approximately $27 million on the House side of the complex. We are currently validating the conceptual scope of these additional projects to include Member impact (if any), manpower requirements to initiate and complete the project and potential time lines. At the same time, we are prioritizing these projects so we may seek approval to reprogram funds to begin design in fiscal year 1999 and adjust budget funding in fiscal year 2000 so that work can begin once designs are complete.

Question. Over the past several years, we have appropriated $35 million for fire safety-related projects. I am going to place in the record a letter the Committee sent to the Architect of the Capitol regarding the IG Report and the use of the $35 million, and the Architect's reply.

Response. The information follows.

[Clerk's note.--The Fire Safety Report can be accessed through the House Inspector General's web page www.house.gov/IG.]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Capitol Power Plant

Mr. Hoyer. My last question in this round, Mr. Chairman, and thank you. I have a parochial interest. As one approaches the Capitol from my district one sees a power plant, a magnificent structure that we have mucked up the skyline with. The highway is there and we can't do anything about the highway. I notice that the power plant chillers are on your list. Now, we don't have time here but I want to note, Mr. Chairman, in talking about the Capitol, that a drive across the South Capitol Street Bridge is the worst entrance to the Capitol of the United States. This is one of the most magnificent structures in the world, and we have a chilling plant spewing forth steam. That is a real tragedy that Congress itself has despoiled the aesthetic impact of coming across the South Capitol Street Bridge, which is where foreign visitors come in from Andrews Air Force base. It is a beautiful parkway until you get to the South Capitol Street Bridge and then you have a great problem. We frankly need a Pennsylvania Avenue project for that entranceway to the Capitol of the United States, and I would hope as our Architect that you would focus on that, working with the District of Columbia, working with GSA and others, and let's see another Southwest Federal Center which hopes to solve some of those problems.

Whatever we are doing with the power plant chillers, I want to know because every time I see it, I am chagrined about what we ourselves have done to that skyline and impinged upon and degraded the view of the Capitol.

Mr. Hantman. Understood.

Mr. Hoyer. That was not a question, obviously, but a comment.

Botanic Garden

Mr. Taylor. Could you give us a brief point on the Botanic Garden?

Mr. Hantman. Certainly. One of the first things I did as Architect of the Capitol in a life safety vein was indicate that the Botanic Garden was unsafe for people to come in. The glass rattled in the wind. The doors swung in the wrong direction. There were inadequate ADA facilities, tripping hazards throughout. So we had a $33.5 million emergency appropriation approved.

We have signed a contract with Clark Construction and they began working in September. There is a 2-year schedule. They started removing the glass and glazing. They started excavation along Independence. They are making good progress on this, and we expect that project will be completed by Clark Construction in September of 2000, and we will be bringing in plants at that time.

In April we will bid a contiguous project that fills out that block front. It is the National Garden. We raised some $10 million from private funding. It will have an interpretive learning center, a butterfly garden, a First Lady's rose garden directly accessed from the Botanic Garden, and we expect that also will be completed concurrently with the Botanic Garden. So we are making good progress on that. The next monthly report will be coming out this Friday to indicate the progress that Clark Construction has been making.

Capital Budget

Mr. Taylor. The capital budget is $87.3 million. It is up almost 90 percent over 1998, and you are 168 percent above the current year. If the Visitor Center is excluded, how do you plan to manage that exploding workload?

Mr. Hantman. As I started talking about earlier relative to the life safety programs, we have turned a lot of our folks into project managers as opposed to designers who would be pushing the pencils on the design board. We have also entered into indefinite quantity contracts with architectural engineering firms and also with procurement and legal support services to get the contracts ready to push the paper out, so to speak.

We are working with other governmental agencies, whether it is NOAA, or the GSA, Corps of Engineers, to support us and give us project specific people to work on projects.

Each of the projects that we come forward with right now will have dollars assigned to it for control and management of that project separate from our normal appropriations for our people, our full time people.

So this is what we are planning to do to expand our scope by grafting on, so to speak, external resources to support us as we need them to be supportive.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follows:]

Question. I noticed in your capital budget that you call for the replacement of the Russell subway, which had a major accident recently. Is there a similar request to replace the Rayburn subway?

Response. Yes. The program for the replacement of the Rayburn Subway has been submitted with our five year Capital Improvement Budget. The current schedule calls for design to be funded and completed in fiscal year 2001 with construction funded in fiscal year 2003. It is anticipated that construction will also be complete within fiscal year 2003.

Capital Projects

Mr. Taylor. How many projects are in this budget and how many have not been completely designed or have formal cost estimates?

I keep hearing that as a question by all of the committee. I know that I am building a house and it has taken a lot longer than I thought, but I am the contractor, the architect, the electrician and I have no money, so I know what my excuses are. Are we attacking the problem of design in any of these areas and getting a cost estimate up so that Congress can focus on it? There is not going to be a lot of sympathy to appropriate money without design and cost estimates and so forth.

Mr. Hantman. A general policy that I have instituted is that we will request money for design, get that design work done, get an estimate. Often we would have to skip a year once that is done just because of the timing of appropriations.

October 1 if we have monies to design, and we start that process, obviously it is going to run past when we are submitting our budget for the next fiscal year. So normally we would have to skip the next year, have detailed information, come to you with a fairly secure line of construction costs, estimated construction costs. There are exceptions to that, though. One of them is the Capitol Dome. We had an emergency appropriation of some $7.5 million for the Capitol Dome. And when I came before this committee, what I indicated was what we are estimating is the first phase so we can open up the patient, find out what the problems are so we can come back to you with the request for the rest of the money.

This gets back to the skipping a year process again. We have an 18-month project for that $7.5 million which is meant to clean out the lead-based paint from the interstitial space between the inner Dome and the outer Dome. So where we can look at the cast iron plates on the exterior of the Dome and see where there are cracks and what we might have to recast, what the basic problems are with the Dome as part of this investigation for this phase of the work. We have a signed contract on that. The contractor should be coming on site next month. We will probably see scaffolding going up probably in March so that the contractor can be coming in and doing his work for this phase.

Conceptually speaking, when we have photographed every plate and saw what every fastener was all about, we would be able to come up with a more detailed number for the total cost of the project. In this year's budget you will see that we have $28 million requested for the next phase of the project. We are doing that based upon the information that we have in hand which we hope to validate during this phase of the work. We also have an out year possible request of some $2 million in case we are off the mark. This is our order of magnitude before we have full construction documents and before we have done all of our exploratory work because we don't want to lose a year in the process, which would happen if we waited until the end of this project and came up with hard numbers based on full construction documents and came back to you again. It is difficult to know full cost unless you go through the entire design process, and where the completion of that is in the budget process. We could lose a year in the appropriations process. So there are some projects that we are talking about that we don't have full estimates for, but those are the exceptions. Most of the projects we try to have full construction bids and costs so we can come to you and say this is the cost of the project.

Increased Project Costs

Mr. Taylor. I hope you appreciate the concern that the Congress has about what has happened. Within the Dome project we were talking about $3 million to 4 million costs, and now it is up to a 40 million; and we are not sure beyond that.

The Cannon garage project was $3 million and now it is up to $11 million, and we don't know where it is going to go from there.

We are going to have to work with you to put focus on the problems that are there. If it takes legislative changes, we can go to the authorizing committees and see what needs to be done. If it is staff changes and funding, we can work with you there. But we have to come up with some better processes which go beyond our conversation today, but I would hope that we could work in that area.

Mr. Hantman. Normally in the past this agency had put markers out in out years to be based on design work yet to be done. And relative to the Cannon garage as well as the Dome, clearly the markers didn't bear any relationship to reality.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. How many projects are in this budget and how many have not been completely designed and had formal cost estimates based on the design?

Response. The AOC has requested fiscal year 2000 funding for a total of 139 capital projects.

All major new projects, except for the Renovation of the Rayburn Cafeteria, are based on formal cost estimates and either completed or substantially completed designs. The Rayburn Cafeteria estimate is based on conceptual input from the Chief Administrative Officer of the House and the current food service contractor and the historical cost of doing similar work in the Capitol. Despite the absence of a formal cost estimate, this project was included in the fiscal year 2000 request because of the desire to advance the completion schedule of the project. There are also several life safety projects that have been included without completed design and formal cost estimates because of the high priority for completing these projects as quickly as possible. These life safety projects are ``Replace Exit Doors for Emergency Egress and Security'' in both the Capitol ($750,000) and House Office Buildings ($900,000). The costs for these two projects were based on a consultant's survey of the number of doors that required modifications and their conceptual estimate based on similar work in the complex. A consultant is currently on board designing the door modifications and validating the conceptual estimates. Final design has not been completed on some of the smaller projects; however, most of the estimates related to these projects were developed by AOC staff based on similar work and historical costs. On rare occasions, projects such as the Dome rehabilitation, arise that require extensive investigation before final design can be developed, but the expected magnitude of cost is still requested in order to avoid a years delay.

A detailed status of design of each project for which construction funds have been requested is provided in response to a question that follows.

Question. We continue to believe strongly that construction funds should not be appropriated unless design and firm cost estimates have been produced. What is your policy on that?

Response. For the fiscal year 1998 budget request the AOC initiated and officially adopted a policy of requesting study/design funding for all significant projects two years before requesting construction funds. The process of asking for design funds and skipping a year before requesting construction funding gives the agency sufficient time to hire a consultant, complete the design, and develop a credible cost estimate based on the completed design before including a request for construction in the budget. Projects that cannot wait for this lengthy process to proceed, such as life safety or time-sensitive projects, may require deviation from this policy. Those projects in the fiscal year 2000 request that do not have completed designs are outlined in the response to the previous question.

Question. For the record, list all projects for which construction funds are requested, the status of design and final cost estimates, and when the designs will be completed. Also indicate the projects that require Speaker or House Office Building Commission approval, and the status of same.

Response. The table that follows provides the design status of all projects for which construction funds were requested. The following seven projects in the House Office Buildings require HOBC approval. Six of the seven projects do not currently have HOBC approval. There are no projects in the Capitol that require the Speaker's approval. In addition we will follow the normal process of coordinating the timing and actual construction with the appropriate committees/offices for any project that could impact the Congress.

Renovations to Rooms 2137 & 2138, RHOB (Judiciary Committee) \1\	$115,000
Renovate Rayburn Cafeteria \2\	3,400,000
Renovate Room B310, RHOB (CAO) \2\	30,000
Expand/Renovate Computer Center, FHOB (CAO) \2\	250,000
Renovations to Room 2128, RHOB (Banking Committee) \2\	170,000
Upgrade Committee Room PA System Wiring \3\	220,000
Emergency Generator, LHOB \4\	609,000

\1\ This project was approved by the HOBC in August 1998.
\2\ Project approval will be requested upon completion of scope and detailed estimate.
\3\ This project will require HOBC approval for each individual committee room.
\4\ HOBC approval of the space for the generator is required.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Capitol Dome Renovation

Mr. Taylor. I would like to have an arrangement for our committee to tour the Dome with you and go over with you some of the ideas and how long the Dome is going to be closed and the construction, and will that affect the Rotunda and the closure of that area. This is very important, I think, to most

Members of Congress and certainly to the general public.

Mr. Hantman. I can talk to that if you would like.

Mr. Taylor. Go ahead.

Mr. Hantman. Because we are working between the inner Dome and the outer Dome. Any containment for the lead based paint will essentially be localized between those two shells. We propose to erect a netting on the inside of the Rotunda which would hang from the top walkway area down below the coffered ceiling in the upper part of the Dome to catch any debris that might fall off from the inner face so that people would not be dissuaded or unable to walk in the Rotunda during the 18-month projected period of the first time frame.

Rather than going back to what was done in 1959 and 1960, when there was scaffolding rising from the floor of the Rotunda and people had to walk through tunnels, in this scheme, and this is the way that we bid it, we would have the netting set up. We would have to close the Rotunda for a period of 2 to 3 weeks to set up that netting. And when it comes down at the end, you would have to close the Rotunda again for that same period to remove it.

One of the issues that we have raised in a letter to the Speaker, and also on the Senate side, is if there should be a lying in state or a special need in the Rotunda during the time of this work, we would request clearance and we would try to design it so that this netting could remain in place because you could not get it down within the 2 to 3-day turnaround that you would need to prepare the Rotunda for that issue. Hopefully when we finish this 18-month phase and we go into working on the outside of the Dome and again on the inside of the Dome in the Rotunda as well, we would be looking at possibly using the same methodology but setting up a scaffolding. So again we would hope to be able to keep the Rotunda open because we are talking about a period of 4 years or so for the next phase of the work.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. When and for how long will the Dome be closed to tours? Will the Rotunda be closed as well?

Response. Based on the timing of the award of the lead-based paint removal contract, it is our expectation that the Dome will have to be closed to tours in early March 1999. It will remain closed through the end of Phase II construction which is scheduled to be completed during the Summer of 2003. It is not feasible to continue Dome tours during the process of removing the lead-based paint because of the need to minimize lead exposure risk to staff and visitors. Since the Dome will be closed for an extended period of time, we are making every effort to keep the initial closing date as flexible as possible to allow access to tours until the contractor's staging work has begun in the interstitial space.

It is anticipated that the Rotunda will be closed on or about April 5, 1999, for approximately 2 to 3 weeks for the installation of the safety netting. We will have a definite date once the contractor has provided confirmation of a start date for the installation. We are also cognizant of the need for the Rotunda to be available for the annual observance of the Holocaust which is held in April. Any potential conflict with the Rotunda closing and the Holocaust observance will be avoided. There will be a similar closing of the Rotunda at the end of

Phase I, which is scheduled for May 2000, for the removal of the safety netting. After the Presidential Inauguration in 2001, the interior portion of Phase II construction will begin, which will include renovations to the cast iron colonnade and shell above the Rotunda. This will require the closing of the Rotunda for what is currently estimated to be a one month period for the erection of scaffolding.

Our goal is to keep the closings of the Rotunda as short as possible and to keep it as unobstructed as possible. For this reason two Rotunda scaffolding options are being considered for the erection of protective netting: 1) standard scaffolding from the Rotunda floor up, similar to that used in the mid-seventies when the Rotunda was last repainted, and in the mid-eighties when the Apotheosis of Washington was conserved, and 2) suspended scaffolding, which would keep the Rotunda floor virtually free from obstruction. Near the end of Phase II construction the Rotunda will be required to be closed in either event for approximately three months to allows for interior stone cleaning and the removal of the scaffolding. It is hoped that the second option will be technically and economically feasible for the different needs of each phase to avoid closing the Rotunda for the entire length of the project.

Re-engineering the AOC

Mr. Taylor. Last year at your request we provided authority to offer early out bonuses to your work force. Your intention is to re-engineer the organization. What are the current plans in that regard?

Mr. Hantman. As required by Public Law 105-275, which you refer to, we have prepared year 1 of our re-engineering program, 3 separate programs. The plan has been presented to the House Committee on Administration, the Senate Committee on Rules Administration for approval. It has also been presented to staff on both the House and the Senate Legislative Branch Appropriations Committees.

At the present time we have received approval from the Senate and we are working with the House committee to address their concerns and comments on our re-engineering program. In fact we have a meeting scheduled for tomorrow afternoon to meet with staff. Hopefully we will be able to answer their questions satisfactorily and get signed off on that program so we can begin to implement the offer of these voluntary buyouts to specific groups within the Architect of the Capitol organization.

Other specific groups would be identified for the second and third year depending on the needs of the Congress. We are getting to the point, Mr. Chairman, where we need to be able to make that decision and start the process almost immediately because we are planning to pay for the buyouts from the appropriated funds of those salaries. So we are now at the midpoint of the year basically and we only have 6 months left of salary left to apply towards those buyouts. And so if we are able to get approval and answer the questions successfully and begin to move, we will be able to implement that fairly soon. We will need a month to offer it to our employees, answer their questions and walk them through the procedure and make sure that they understand what their benefits are and issues are, and if we get approval hopefully in the next couple of days we would be able to have those employees receive their buy-out opportunities and leave by--what was our time frame on that? I guess it would be early March. Early March.

Thermal Storage Facility/East Plant Chiller

Mr. Taylor. You touched upon the power plant in answer to Mr. Hoyer's question. We have the thermal storage facility. What is that?

Would you also touch upon in the same answer the east plant chiller replacement project? How long do you think that it will take to complete that?

Mr. Hantman. For the east plant chiller, we have requested funding in 3 increments. We have $5 million and we are requesting another $5 million, an estimated $15 million total cost on the east plant chiller. They are aged facilities. They have PCBs. It is a life safety issue. They really need to go away. Freon, I'm sorry. The freon, that needs to come out.

So that is basically a must do life safety type of issue. Also it has basically outlived its usable life and we can't risk keeping it on.

In conjunction with that, we are looking at a thermal energy storage system of water or ice storage that would provide a portion of the cooling required for the buildings in the Capitol complex. When you have this water or ice storage facility, it is a lot cheaper to cool off that water at nighttime electricity rates, use that water for cooling during normal daytime, basically stockpile it, having produced it at lower energy rates. We think that there are major savings that could be achieved.

When the Capitol Visitor Center had projected using thermal storage and it turned out not to be effective for the Visitor Center, there was a projected cost of about $8 million for the project with a $1 million payback on an annual basis. So basically it would have been an 8-year payback on the project, but we have to calculate what we think the savings are on this particular element. We think that it is good news and it would be useful for us to be able to maximize the value of the energy that we are using.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. What is the status of design work for the East Plant chiller replacement project? When do you expect to get the replacement project underway? At what total cost and how long to complete?

Response. The East Plant Chiller Replacement project will be in design this Spring. A Commerce Business Daily announcement seeking consulting firms interested in performing the design for this project was issued last summer. Proposals were received from numerous highly qualified firms in the fall. These proposals have all be evaluated to identify those firms that have the highest technical qualifications and best cost proposals. Interviews for the final section of a consultant are scheduled to occur in February 1999, and award of a contract will follow thereafter. Upon award of the contract, design will proceed immediately with a study to confirm the exact configuration of the chiller replacement and development of a pre-purchase bid package for the chillers and other large equipment with long manufacturing lead times. This pre-purchase bid package should be bid and awarded this summer. Final design of the entire project should be complete in early 2000.

The phased installation of the new chillers is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2000 and continue through fiscal year 2003 at a total estimated costs of $15 million based on the schematic design.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, do you have any further questions?

Perimeter Security Plan

Mr. Pastor. I do. I have 2 questions. The security plan, I haven't had a chance to review it, but where are we? I will ask briefly on that.

Mr. Hantman. The perimeter security program?

Mr. Pastor. The reason that I ask this question, I had a conversation with some of the Speaker's staff, and one of the concerns is that there is a security plan that has been approved by a task force but it hasn't been implemented. And so my question to you is: What are the problems and why haven't you been able to implement it?

Mr. Hantman. $20 million in emergency funding was appropriated for the perimeter security plan. That was the 1998 supplemental bill.

There are two components of that. The major component was to deal with Capitol Square, the Capitol and the grounds surrounding the Capitol building. There were about 3 or 3\1/2\ million dollars allocated to secure the issues relative to the Senate office buildings. The House did not have a component at that point.

We have gotten approval from the Senate to proceed with Delaware and C Street components around their office buildings. We have made presentations to them relative to the type of bollards that we want to be using, which are basically the same as the White House bollards that is used around the security perimeter of the White House. It is a Secret Service bollard that has been designed by the Secret Service specifically for the White House. It is crash tested by the Secret Service. We propose to use that bollard not only on the Senate side but on Capitol Square. We have gotten approval from the Senate side, and approval has not been forthcoming from the House side. Some of the issues relate to the fact that it is not a total security system. Clearly if we put bollards 4 feet on center, motorcycles can get through unless you put chains, and some areas would have chains for normal police concerns, but there are issues that are open and have not been satisfied to the extent of the House and we have not been able to move forward on the program.

Mr. Pastor. When do you think that we are going to move forward?

Mr. Hantman. This is a great concern to the Capitol Police Board, which I sit on, and we can talk about it when the Capitol Police Board comes in.

Re-Engineering Plan

Mr. Pastor. The second question that I have deals with your re-engineering plan and the buyout. I think that is one factor. Not knowing all the problems that you have, I know that you have the office cleanup people concerned about what is going to happen to them. Obviously many people have been here many years and they have invested a lot of time and effort.

Is your re-engineering plan causing this discontentment with your employees? It seems to me that you are having problems with your staff, and I usually say that the best union organizer is a bad manager.

Mr. Hantman. We are in the service business. Our most important component of our organization are our people. There is every intent and every opportunity for us, and we have been rebuilding our agency so that we in fact make our people the most important thing. We have totally rebuilt our human resources organization. There basically was none when I came here. We have hired Hector Suarez from OPM to come in and come up with uniform standards across the campus. Things were done differently on the House and on the Senate side and in the Capitol. We are trying to standardize that, and working with the union, people represented in all of those buildings, we need to have those agreed to. We are bargaining in good faith with the union. We look forward to very strong positive working relationships with the union.

The concept of offering the buyout is one that from my perspective is a win/win situation for everybody. From an economic and governmental perspective, it is more economical to offer a buyout, a voluntary buyout. It has a cap of $25,000 based upon years of service and age, things of that nature, and there is a governmental formula that is worked out on that basis. Also it is a voluntary opportunity. We have a very low turnover rate in this agency. In order for us to re-engineer, to have a job where instead of sending an electrical guy or a mechanical guy and a carpenter and a painter out to do a job, if we had multi-tasking, where people are trained and have had their salaries adjusted for multi-tasking, it enriches their job and saves us money as well.

We are not considering a RIF. A RIF would cost us more money than a buyout. So if we re-engineer the organization, create the type of succession plan needed, bring on younger people in areas that currently everybody is at a level 10. You have an electrician screwing in a light bulb. You need a level 5 to do that. We need to stratify our work levels.

The concept of a buyout would give us elbow room to be able to fill those positions, either internally or go outside to get the best quality service at the most economical price for the government.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Question. For the record, estimate annual savings and costs of your re-engineering program. Indicate the improvements and other changes you hope to make as a result of this program.

Response. Based on the plan developed by the Superintendents, Senior Management Staff and Arthur Anderson Consulting, Inc., we project with full participation and acceptance of the 212 buyout offers for Phase I, a potential annual savings to up to $618,643 based on withholding the refilling of up to 17 voluntarily vacated positions. These positions will not impact our commitment to provide service excellence and preserve, maintain, and enhance the national treasures entrusted to our care. We also project with the above assumptions an additional savings potential of $1,458,763 which is a result of the restructuring of vacated positions as outlined below. These savings will be reinvested into Agency operational needs to provide for improvements and or changes in operations such as: Interim staffing while jobs are filled on a permanent basis; Investment in program and policy development in such areas as Health and Safety, Workers' Compensation, Human Resource Program and Policy Development (to meet/exceed Human Resources Act requirements); In support of business process reengineering to streamline program and service delivery (correspondence management and control, personnel transaction processing, etc.); In support of program roll-out needs of current and future funded automation initiatives (policy and program development and documentation).

The total estimated cost for each employee that accepts the buyout/earlyout will be approximately $33,159, (this includes an incentive payment of $21,542, the additional retirement contribution of $6,841, annual leave payment of $4,173 that would be made upon retirement even in the absence of a buyout program and agency's FICA and Medicare contribution of $603).

It should be noted that these estimates are based on the assumption the sufficient numbers of AOC employees will exercise their option to apply for a buyout/earlyout. If less than projected numbers exercise their option, then the projected results will be reduced.

As noted above, through this program will be reengineering positions that are vacated (based on employees' resigning or deciding to retire to accept a buyout/earlyout), to provide for: A component of multi-skilled staff with expertise to work in several disciplines; The restructuring of positions to ensure that work is performed at grade levels commensurate with identified tasks; Positions that can be used for the Architect's Mobility Program. The Program will provide opportunities for staff in career limiting positions.

Another element of our program provides for a continuous assessment to determine additional opportunities for work process consolidation. Through this type of effort we have already achieved a number of successes: consolidated the landscaping and ground maintenance functions for the Supreme Court and the Library of Congress under the Agency Landscape Architect; consolidated the U.S. Capitol House HVAC shop and the U.S. Capitol Senate HVAC shop resulting in a reduced number of supervisory positions.

Question. For the record, explain the savings and the time sequencing of savings with the completion of the project.

Response. The attached time line provides an overview of the projected time sequencing of savings for our buyout/earlyout program. The specific time line and savings projections for Year II and III have not been fully developed because up to this time we have focused our efforts on developing a comprehensive plan for Year I. Upon approval and implementation of the Year I buyout/earlyout program, we will replicate the process and analysis completed with the Superintendents to develop our Year I plan in order to complete development for the Year II plan. We will then submit the Year II plan for Committee review and approval prior to implementation.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wamp?

Construction and Cost Estimates

Mr. Wamp. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is good to be back, and Mr. Hoyer and I return from the last Congress sitting on this committee. I am concerned, though, often when we get into these construction and cost estimate issues that things seem to be slipping and part of the problem is the turnover of the Congress and turnover of this committee and the budget cycles that you talk about and not having forward funding for construction projects.

I came out of the private sector, and I came out of the construction industry where we funded things at the bank, drawing down funds until the project was finished. And then we were forced to stay within the constraints of the budget and finish on time.

The big three for me are the Dome, the Visitor Center and the Botanic Garden. Being a Republican, I was battered by my colleagues over the Botanic Gardens and it ended up in the supplemental emergency spending bill. You say the cost will be $31 million. You now have your contractor. They are going to report on site and you believe they will be finished by September of 2000?

Mr. Hantman. That is their schedule.

Mr. Wamp. In that case on that project, have you actually finished all of your work?

Mr. Hantman. We have finished all of the construction documents. We went out to competitive bid. We established that $33.5 million budget based on firm drawings and firm estimates. And the numbers for this contractor came in within the area that we projected and we are on budget on that.

Mr. Wamp. So it is a lump sum contract, not a cost plus contract. Do you expect that to come in on or under budget and on time?

Mr. Hantman. Yes.

Capitol Dome Project

Mr. Wamp. But when you look at the Dome, I am fascinated every time--both of my brothers and my father are licensed architects and my younger brother particularly, he lives in a CAD machine. He never even picks up a pencil, and he has all of these computer models to show how everything is going to look to the point that in a three-dimensional kind of way you can walk through the buildings.

How automated are we with computer models of the Dome? Would we be as fascinated looking at your work as I am with my brother's?

Mr. Hantman. I think you would be. One of the projects that we accomplished within this $7.5 million issue is we had an internationally known structural engineer do a 3-dimensional CAD analysis of the structure of the Dome to make sure that there were no fundamental problems with the Dome. We were talking about cracked plates and sealant and paint removal and recasting of balustrades and things like that. We certainly could share that with you.

In terms of again the first phase of this project, the $7\1/2\ million phase, we had drawings. We had estimates. We went out to bid on this first phase, and we came in with our budget. So this first phase is going to be fine. But the first phase was only to determine the cost for the overall estimate. As I described, we don't have all of that information yet and we have come before you with what we think will be the next phase.

Level of security, we think is fairly good. We have 2 and a half million in an out year because we don't know if we will need that additional money. That is the magnitude of where we think that we will be ending up, but those construction documents will be done in the next phase.

Mr. Wamp. But let me point out that because of technology and your ability through this CAD analysis of the Dome itself, it is such an extraordinary project, that we could very well be saving big dollars by doing this early in the most efficient way. I think this may be the most valuable part of this. We need to plug in and get involved in this because when you have phase 2, which is unknown right now, we don't want this project to explode in cost. I know that is what you are working on with the $7.5 million--to come up with the most efficient way of addressing this. And when you get to the Visitor Center, we need to address this again. And like the Botanic Garden, we need to stay on top of it.

Mr. Hantman. The concept, whether it is 18 months initially or 12 months, whatever it turns out to be, one of the biggest fears in any architect's or engineer's area is the words, the four little words, ``While you are at it, add this in, add this in.'' We need to define the scope of work clearly and not change the scope because that is normally what impacts the budget.

Mr. Wamp. Which is the nature of government projects versus private sector projects. They love change orders. Thank you.

ADA Compliance

Mr. Hoyer. Let me ask just some quick questions and hopefully get quick answers. The South Door that I referred to, how long is that going to be closed to make that ADA compliant?

Mr. Hantman. Please go ahead, Amita.

Ms. Poole. 30 days.

Mr. Hoyer. Haven't most of the improvements been prefabricated?

Mr. Hantman. Absolutely. They are ready to come on site.

Mr. Hoyer. Why will it take so long?

Ms. Poole. We are going to be demolishing the existing structure, and we are building a vestibule. All of the electronics needs to be run, including the wiring for the camera and all of the security wiring. Additionally, we are bringing it up to telecom standards so you don't have wires. Currently you have carpet rugs that are laid over the wires. We are going to be channeling the floor to put the wires inside the floor and make it not only ADA compliant but life and safety compliant.

Mr. Hoyer. I am confident that you are not ascribing ADA compliance costs to the ancillary work which probably costs more than the ADA compliance costs?

Ms. Poole. Yes, sir. We are charging it----

Mr. Hoyer. The reason I say that, as you know, I was the sponsor of the ADA in the House, and the projected costs are far beyond what they actually are, and I want to make sure that we have an accurate cost of what that is.

Waste Recycling

Mr. Hoyer. House recycling program, where are we on that just quickly because I have to go. I apologize.

Ms. Theiss. Currently the House complex sends about 2,200 tons of paper for recycling annually. The program has not been very successful, but during fiscal year 1998 it underwent a renovation in the House group.

The Superintendent of the House introduced color coded bags for material separation that our custodial staff actually used each evening when they were removing the office recycle program materials. And through the efforts of an ad hoc task force many of the office members from this committee staff did a pilot program that had at-your-desk recycling. It was a dual bag process of a waste basket, a high grade and mixed grade paper. That has provided us with the information to say that this pilot will work and people in the House will recycle at their desk and they don't consider this an inconvenience. So we are preparing to expand that pilot out.

During fiscal year 1998, we were basically out of service for 3 months to meet some life safety issues that had to be addressed in our recycling program. However, we have this $23,000 as value for recycled materials compared to $2,000 in 1997.

Mr. Hoyer. Would that include aluminum and glass?

Ms. Theiss. We do aluminum cans and glass and some plastics.

Mr. Hoyer. We have some cans in my office, but we are not as good as we ought to be. I recycle at home, and in St. Mary's County we have a transfer station where we put our trash and somebody else picks it up. They are overflowing. We use so much material on this Hill that if we recycled, $25,000 would be a drop in the bucket, if we really did it. $25 million over the course of a year ought to be what we are doing.

Mr. Chairman, we need to focus, maybe it is an educational thing; but just look at this table. Just the paper on this table and make sure that it is recycled.

Ms. Theiss. We have worked with the superintendents in this jurisdiction, as well as the task force and determined that we had a couple of limitations that initially impeded the recycling program. Some of it was space in offices to put the trash cans. Other space to further sort the materials once it came out of the office space and went downstairs to be sorted. We have encountered violations of life safety codes, OSHA requirements for life and safety that had to be addressed, and we didn't have storage space available to take the materials until they were ready to be picked up by our group.

Thanks to the efforts of our House Administration and working with the superintendents, they have located places where we can move things. Bob has initiated an effort with our current contractor to possibly get daily pickup so we can accommodate this need and further increase the ability to do recycling.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Harrison on my staff will pursue this with you. We need to escalate this. We want Americans to conserve, and we ought to do that ourselves. The last question, and, Mr. Chairman, if I can submit some questions for the record.

Mr. Taylor. Sure. Without objection.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Privatization

Mr. Hoyer. You talk about human resources. That is treating people fairly, making sure that people feel good about their jobs, making sure that they feel that they are not under attack and feel relatively secure in their employment. ``Re-engineering'' can be a fancy word for getting rid of people. I am concerned about that.

With respect to privatizing or contracting out, where are we at this point in time with janitorial services and other services which are perceived to be noncritical to Capitol performance?

Mr. Hantman. We are looking at each individual group and using Arthur Andersen as a consultant to help us determine relative costs on the outside, doing benchmarking.

There is not much privatization for this first year's buyout for the groups which have been identified. We are talking about one small group potentially. And it depends on the buyouts, who takes the buyouts. This is all voluntary.

Mr. Hoyer. Contracting out would not be voluntary. If you make a determination to contract out, the employee is subject to whatever deal we make with the contracting authority.

Mr. Hantman. What we are doing is seeing where our buyouts leave us the holes and what flexibility we have in the organization. And when we see what flexibility we have and determine the cost whether we bring people back to staff up or whether it is best done in the private sector. It is totally voluntary. Nobody is being RIFed or pushed out in any of the things that we are considering.

We have upward mobility programs that we are planning. We have major training programs that are available to all of our people, for computers and other things so they can improve their skills and hopefully move up in the organization.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follows:]

Question. Many AOC workers are convinced you are planning to privatize the custodial services in the House. Is that under active consideration?

Response. Our fiduciary responsibilities dictate that we evaluate every element of the Agency in terms of efficiency and cost effectiveness. Part of that evaluation is the benchmarking process, where we compare all current in-house operations against industry standards and best business practices. That evaluation throughout the Agency is ongoing and is investigating opportunities for improving efficiency and cost effectiveness through re-engineering. Current information on government and private sector standards for custodial services indicate that our current custodial operations can be improved through re-engineering. I have not ruled out any reengineering tool to achieve cost effective and efficient services. However, privatization for privatizaion's sake will not be the basis on any decisions.

Employee Morale

Mr. Hoyer. I think the morale of the people who work on Capitol Hill is very, very important. I talked last night about Bill Malry, who died and had been with us from 1966, but there are an awful lot of people on this Hill who are sort of anonymous and nobody knows, but without them we couldn't function well and keep it healthy, clean, and safe, and we need to make sure that they know that we are concerned about them.

Mr. Hantman. My goal is that when I leave office, well before then, we set up standards, procedures and methodologies and an organization that will help maintain the services that Congress needs in a quality way and maintain these wonderful landmark structures that we have going forward. We are building an organization for the future.

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you.

Mr. Taylor. Ms. Granger?

ADA Compliance Costs

Ms. Granger. You have mentioned ADA compliance. I would like some information about where we are with ADA compliance overall, what costs we have incurred thus far and what the projected cost is going to be for compliance? I hate to take my fellow Texan's time, Mr. Archer is waiting.

Mr. Hantman. The major thrust with ADA compliance is accessibility to buildings. That is the first level. All of our buildings are accessible for the ADA. Not every entrance, but basically it is required that one major entrance is required, and we have that. There are areas, just south of the South Door on the House side and north of the North Door on the Senate side which have ramps that are wooden. They are falling apart. We are asking for funding to reconstruct those the way that befits the Capitol with ADA ramps so that those levels are accessible to the handicapped.

The door replacements that we are doing right now, we are removing revolving doors for both code as well as ADA issues, and we have monumental doors in this building which currently in terms of accessibility or egress don't meet code. We have to solve those. We are ready to do our 8th door in the Capitol now, and you probably won't be able to tell that those doors were done because they are done in keeping with the fabric of the Capitol. They have panic hardware and security devices so if someone wants to go through, the police know about that. We are very serious about that.

In the Visitor Center, ADA accessibility is critical so they can move through the facilities and into the Capitol with ease. Elevators would be prepared on the East Front to take people down as well as the ramp ways. There is more work to be done, but we have been spending the money along with Congressman Hoyer's concerns very appropriately, and we continue to budget that on an annual basis.

Reprogrammings

Mr. Taylor. For the record, insert all reprogramming actions or other documents that require committee approval.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follows:]

Question. For the record, insert all reprogramming actions or other documents that required Committee approval.

Response. The following information is provided for the record.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. We thank you very much.

Mr. Hantman. Thank you, very much. We look forward to working with you all.

[Questions submitted for the record by Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

WITNESSES

HON. BILL ARCHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS; VICE CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

LINDY L. PAULL, CHIEF OF STAFF

MARY M. SCHMITT, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF

BERNARD A. SCHMITT, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF

Mr. Taylor. We have Vice-Chairman Bill Archer. And I am pleased to welcome you, Chairman Archer. The last time we appeared together was in my district, I believe, in your hope to bring us a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut. And I don't want to stand in your way a minute longer, so I welcome you to the committee.

Oral Statement

Mr. Archer. Mr. Chairman, I wish I could at any point in my life have the popularity that you have with the people in your district, I will say that. But we are here on another matter today, and I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you in order to make the request for the Joint Committee on Taxation's appropriation for the year 2000.

Senator Bill Roth and I have submitted a written statement, which I would ask unanimous consent to appear in your record. But, just briefly, let me make a couple of points.

The Joint Committee is requesting for the fiscal year 2000 an amount of $6,256,000, and that is a $290,600 increase over 1999. This is a 4.7 percent increase, which I think fits within the general standards. Of that amount, $223,000 will be allocated to cost of living expenses for personnel and the remaining $67,600 will be used for nonpersonnel expenses.

The Joint Committee, as a result of the IRS Restructuring and Reform Act, has been given additional responsibilities under the law. In fact, it was estimated during the consideration of the IRS Reform Act, which all of us wanted and all of us applauded on a bipartisan basis, was that their additional responsibilities would require approximately $290,000 of additional staff resources annually.

That is not being requested in this budget, but what we are requesting is 1\1/2\ more full-time employees for staff economists. These economists will work on revenue estimates to accommodate Members with this complex Tax Code.

I would say as an aside, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to save you the bulk of all of this money when I appear next year, if I can succeed in my quest of abolishing the income tax and replacing it with the consumption tax, which would eliminate all of these complexities in the Code and all of the need of the Joint Committee to be able to make estimates to Members who feel that there is some little part of it they want to change. It is very, very difficult to accommodate all of the requests that come in from 435 Members.

So these additional 1\1/2\ full-time employees would work on that, and it would also give additional staff resources to develop macroeconomic estimating capability so that we can move toward greater accuracy in our estimates of new changes in the Code.

Under the IRS Reform Act that I mentioned, the Joint Committee is required to report to the Congress at least once a year on the overall state of the Federal tax system and to make recommendations for any changes in the tax law, provided that you appropriate extra money for that purpose, and the law says that, subject to amounts being appropriated to cover the costs of doing that. No amount is included in this request for that purpose. Should you desire to see that the Joint Committee make that kind of report to both the Senate and the House at least once a year, that would require an additional $200,000 and three new full-time employee slots.

Briefly, that is all that I would say to you. The entire witness statement is more comprehensive. And thank you again for your time, for your consideration, and for the funding that you have given over the years to the Joint Committee.

Let me, also as an aside, say that the Joint Committee is virtually unique. This staff is professional, it is nonpartisan, and it serves both the House and the Senate, which makes it very, very unusual, and it does an outstanding job in essential areas to enable us to cope with the Tax Code and to be able to make changes where Members believe that those changes are appropriate.

So I have with me Ms. Paull, Lindy Paull, who is the Chief of Staff of the Joint Committee and is doing an excellent job over there; and we will both be available for any questions that you might have.

Written Testimony

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. And I believe you also have Ms. Mary Schmitt and Bernard Schmitt, who are committee Deputy Chiefs of Staff.

Mr. Archer. Exactly. I did not mean to ignore the two of you. They are outstanding professionals.

Revenue Estimates

Mr. Taylor. We welcome you all.

Mr. Chairman, you mentioned that you, of course, serve the Members of the Ways and Means and Finance Committees, and Members of the House and the Senate, who are nonmembers of those committees. That presents a special workload for you. Would you care to describe that workload, what you provide outside the Members of the House and Senate taxwriting committees?

Mr. Archer. You mean services that are made available to----

Mr. Taylor. Nontax writing committee.

Mr. Archer [continuing]. Or individuals or organizations that are not Members of Congress?

Mr. Taylor. Yes. Yes.

Mr. Archer. Lindy, do you want to respond to that?

Ms. Paull. Well, I think the nontax writing committee members is what you want. Our staff is available to all Members of Congress, all 100 Senators, 435 Members of Congress, to help develop, analyze, provide advice, and estimate proposals to change the tax law.

We have an attachment to our written testimony that you entered into the record that shows you the number of requests that we received last year. It is attachment Number D, item D, from all Members of Congress; and there are a few other requests. We get some requests from CBO and some from GAO as well, almost totalling 5,000 requests for the 2 years of the last Congress. And also you can see how successful we were in responding to those requests. In some cases, the requests become outdated and we correspond with the Members over that.

We are very sensitive to making sure that our resources are available to nontax writing committee members, and you can see a breakdown of our responsiveness to them as well.

Mr. Archer. I would like to be sure that we are completely responsive to your question. What is included in the ``others'' category?

Ms. Paull. It is principally the Congressional Budget Office and the GAO that we would provide estimates to.

Mr. Archer. So these are not services that are provided to any private citizens outside of the congressional operation, but the only nonmember part, which if you look at this sheet is very, very, very small, relative to the total, would be to the GAO and operations that are directly part of the congressional operation. I don't know of any services--and correct me if I am wrong--that are given to private citizens.

Ms. Paull. We, of course, meet with constituents and Members and help with the development of the proposals that Members would like.

Mr. Taylor. Those were the areas we were concerned about in our earlier question.

Mr. Archer. Mr. Chairman, let me also be absolutely certain this is clear. No private citizen can request an estimate and get an estimate from the Joint Committee. The only people who can get estimates are people who are Members of Congress.

High Income Tax Returns

Mr. Taylor. How much of the committee's workload is devoted to the review of high income tax returns? And I would be interested in knowing what conclusions the committee may have drawn from the complexity of the returns. I have an idea what your recommendations may be to solve it.

Ms. Paull. For major tax proposals, we do look at the distribution of those proposals by income class. Our models break down by income class what the effect of major proposals would be. So we are attentive to the income distribution when a proposal is moving through Congress. We are attentive to the effects it would have on all income classes, including high-income taxpayers. In recent years the Congress, however, has been targeting many proposals so that the high-income taxpayers do not benefit from them.

Mr. Taylor. Of course, that is a definition of high income tax.

Ms. Paull. Correct.

Mr. Taylor. Some of the things we try to encourage are capital gains reductions. The other parts of the Code often negate that. Have you any other conclusions in reviewing that about this tax simplification or what could be done, what should be done to improve the Code?

Ms. Paull. To improve the Code?

Mr. Taylor. Well, that is a broad question. You can answer it any way you would like.

Ms. Paull. One of the missions for the staff of the Joint Committee is to make recommendations to simplify the Tax Code. We have made recommendations in the past. It has been some time. We are undergoing an effort right now to make more bold simplification proposals to the Congress.

If the Congress wanted to focus on fundamental tax reform, which the Ways and Means Committee held 11 to 15 hearings in the last 2 years on, and the Chairman has been working on a proposal, then you would see a big change in the Tax Code. And that would be something that would obviously be focused more on simplifying the Tax Code for people.

We also, under the IRS restructuring bill, have been asked to do a complexity analysis of any proposals that have widespread applicability to individuals and small businesses that are reported by the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee. And we are undertaking efforts to be prepared for that as well, as soon as legislation moves this year.

Mr. Taylor. Well, your Chairman, Mr. Archer, is an excellent advocate for his proposals that he mentioned a moment ago. And I have been impressed by him and certainly support him.

Mr. Pastor, do you have any questions?

Refund Review

Mr. Pastor. I just have one question on Exhibit II.

Ms. Paull. Okay.

Mr. Pastor. You have types of taxpayers, and then you list them out--individuals, estates, trusts. What does that mean? Here, I will hand it to you.

Ms. Paull. These statistics are for our refund cases. One of the statutory duties of the Joint Committee on Taxation is to review all refunds in excess of $1 million, and this is a tabulation of the cases in our most recent year. And, actually, it is a short year, nine months, because we are trying to get on to Congress's fiscal year for this reporting. We would have reviewed 23 individual income tax refunds, 7 refunds for taxable estates, 1 trust and 408 corporate refund claims.

Mr. Pastor. So you get the information from IRS?

Ms. Paull. Yes, from the IRS.

Mr. Pastor. And then you look at it and----

Ms. Paull. That is right. And we look at it for the purpose of making sure the IRS is administering the law in a uniform basis across the country, as well as making sure the congressional intent is being adhered to for recent legislation.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you very much, Chairman Archer. I appreciate your appearing today and, not only that, your hard work in your committee and what you have done with the Congress. We appreciate that.

Mr. Archer. I appreciate the Chairman's nice words.

Wednesday, February 3, 1999.

CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

WITNESSES

HON. JAMES W. ZIGLAR, SERGEANT AT ARMS, U.S. SENATE; CHAIRMAN, CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

HON. WILSON LIVINGOOD, SERGEANT AT ARMS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES; MEMBER, CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

HON. ALAN M. HANTMAN, ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL; MEMBER, CAPITOL POLICE BOARD

GARY L. ABRECHT, CHIEF, U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. Taylor. We will now go to the Police Board.

The committee will be in order. We will now take up the U.S. Capitol Police budget, which was presented by the Capitol Police Board. The members of the board are accompanied by Chief Gary Abrecht and members of his staff.

It is good to have the Chairman of the Capitol Police Board here today, the newly appointed Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, James Ziglar. Glad to have you, sir. That is a very important assignment. The Senate needs a great deal of care, and we appreciate them. If there is anything to the contrary being said in the House, we certainly want to dispel that.

Mr. Ziglar. I will take your message.

Mr. Taylor. As is customary, we will place your biographical sketch in the record at this time.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. We also have the House Sergeant at Arms, Bill Livingood. And I want to welcome you and, of course, the Architect of the Capitol, who has just been before us. And we welcome you as a member of the board.

Before we proceed, let me state the budget requests that has been submitted to the committee. Members will find the details on page 247, if you need. Overall, the request is for $90.2 million. $81.2 million is for salaries, and $9 million is for general expenses. These funds would support 1,251 FTEs, which is the current level.

Statements of Capitol Police Board and Chief Gary L. Abrecht

Now, all of your statements have been put into the record, but I will offer you an opportunity to make a brief statement, if you would like, before we start questions. And it is not necessary. We can start right in with questions.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Livingood. Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce Mr. Ziglar professionally to the committee on behalf of the rest of the Police Board. And Jim Ziglar comes to you with a background in law, finance and business management. I think this will be a big benefit to the Capitol Police Board, and already we have seen enthusiasm and a real interest in security and security matters, and I think this will be a tremendous benefit to our board. And he might want to make a statement.

Mr. Ziglar. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is indeed an honor to be able to serve as Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate. I am very fond of the House; and we have very strong feelings, positive feelings over there toward the House.

I inherited the job of Chairman of the Police Board shortly after my arrival, so I am very pleased to have such good people as the Chief, Bill Livingood and Alan Hantman to bring a lot of knowledge and wisdom to me. And we have developed a very close working relationship on the Police Board just in a very short period of time. I have made some good friends out of all of this already.

I should note that we have been going through some extraordinary times on the Hill in the last few months. I arrived here in November in the middle of the impeachment process; and that has obviously created a number of security issues up here. And while I only know secondhand about how well the police force responded on the House side, I can tell you that on the Senate side the police force has been extraordinary. We have gone almost without a hitch over there in terms of security, and the efficiency and professionalism of this police force is just remarkable to me.

So I wanted to say how much we appreciate the Chief and the job you have done. And I can certainly say that I am a very big supporter of the police force, and I know Senator Lott is also very interested in security and is a big supporter of the police force.

There are a number of issues that we are identifying that are important such as physical security upgrades, personnel needs and those sorts of things; and I am very much in support of the plans that are being put together. Coming from a business background, where I ran a business, the one thing I know is that when you need to do something and you have figured out what you want to do, then you go ahead and do it. And so I will--that is my approach to things.

And I will sometimes push hard to get things done, because where I came from, time is money. And, in this case, it is not just money, but it is also the security and safety of the public that comes up here and, obviously, the security of the Members and the staff that work up here. And I think that we have some big challenges, but we are up to it. And certainly on my watch as Chairman of the Police Board, we are going to push hard to get things done in a very efficient manner.

I am also looking at the way we do business on the Police Board and in the Police Department, as the Chief knows, and asking some questions based on my background as a businessman. I hope that we can do things most efficiently so that the taxpayers get the best bang for their buck.

So that is my agenda this year. I am looking forward to serving as Chairman, and I am looking forward especially to working with this committee and working with the House folks. I appreciate the opportunity to say a few words.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. I certainly, in my nine years here, have appreciated the police force and what they have done. I often comment on the fact that you have an unusual job, Chief and Sergeant. You are law enforcement for a large portion of the area of the Hill and with what that all entails, and which every policeman does. But you have some 9 million people coming through a very small area, which you have got to protect. You protect not only those people, but the staff and the Congress at the same time and you are courteous, answer questions, serve as a guide, and as an information service at the same time.

In addition, you have unusual care of visitors from other countries, and some of them bring terrorists or other attractions that certainly find the crowds, and all the work you have to do makes it very attractive to them and you do a superb job in your efforts there.

And, of course, courage is not lacking in your department at all. I was in the chair last fall when we lost two officers here, and their conduct was exemplary, and the actions the remaining police force took to protect the people here, including our guests and our staff and Members of Congress, was superb. I commend you for that action, seemingly, if not your entire action everyday.

I, of course, have spoken to the Architect and his staff earlier. We all want to protect our guests, foreign, and our national citizens here and Members of Congress. But we want to keep the Capitol open. Most Members of Congress, I feel, desire that. Because it is the People's House, and as long as we are under a democracy you are going to have, hopefully, millions of people coming in.

That will be our first concern, to take reasonable steps to protect our guests and ourselves, but to keep this building open and in a way that is not so inconvenient that people wouldn't want to come here.

Having said that, I would like to start with our questions.

Security Enhancements

Last year, the Congress proposed $106 million for security enhancements to the Capitol complex now, including the Library of Congress buildings and what has been termed our campus in this area. Can you give us a general idea of how you plan to expend these funds? I will ask that to the whole board, and any one of you can answer it if you would like.

Mr. Abrecht. The $106 million for security, Mr. Chairman, for security enhancements, will be used to correct security deficiencies which were identified in two reports. First, the 1995 United States Capitol Police and United States Secret Service Joint Survey; and it was supplemented by a 1998 Capitol Police Security Task Force which together identified these security deficiencies.

These reports identified several vulnerabilities throughout the Capitol complex attributed to staffing shortages at perimeter entrances and the lack of technology to provide early warning of intrusions and threats. The security enhancements package will provide additional personnel at perimeter posts, improve detection capabilities against intruders by the deployment of alarms and closed circuit television cameras and improve detection capabilities against explosive, chemical and vehicular attacks. It also increases our operations capabilities to counter and respond to these threats.

A security enhancement plan was developed and will be submitted to this committee and the several other committees of jurisdiction hopefully this week. That outlines the entire processes we intend to utilize to identify new technology and properly deploy it. It outlines each item, how it will be acquired and designed and the process to implement it.

It is a pretty monstrous book. You should have it this week.

Mr. Taylor. Good.

Congress has made several appropriations for physical security. Can you explain the difference between this fund and the security enhancements fund?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes, sir. You will recall that, in 1996, we identified some physical security problems on the campus. And we at that time outlined a three-phase physical security upgrade. That upgrade focuses on replacing vital infrastructure for our security systems and replacing some of the antiquated systems that provided protection.

This program has been very successful, as demonstrated by our new capabilities for the Members' duress alarm system, the fiber-optic backbone, access control and alarm systems and state-of-the-art monitoring. We are now in the process of completing phase II and will soon come back to the committee to initiate phrase III.

When the security enhancement fund became available, we reassessed our three-phase program to ensure that we could build upon the existing upgrade to implement the security enhancement plan. As outlined in our original briefing on the upgrade, we provided infrastructure designed to meet all the future requirements to include all of the security enhancements that will be coming in the second plan.

Mr. Taylor. Should we combine those funds, do you think, or keep them separately?

Mr. Abrecht. It is our position that they should be kept separate.

The physical security upgrade is on track. It will be finished here within the space of less than a year. We believe that we can finish that program out. There is no conflict between the two. That one essentially provides the backbone upon which the enhancements will ride. That will come from the security enhancement plan. There is no need to combine the two.

Mr. Taylor. We have had certain authorities for planning and overseeing our security-related expenditures that have been transferred from the Architect to the Capitol Police in recent years. Can you summarize those transfers and why they were necessary?

Mr. Abrecht. In 1995, Mr. Livingood became the House Sergeant at Arms; and coming as he did from a large security organization in the executive branch, he noted that there were some deficiencies with the alarm systems throughout the Capitol complex, that they were antiquated, they were ineffective and in disrepair. As a result, in February of 1996, the Architect of the Capitol commissioned a study to review the security organization and security management providing security for the Capitol complex.

The study found that the physical security program was largely reactive, reflected limited strategic vision and lacked the human and technical resources necessary to effectively produce the best possible physical security program. It noted that the program lacked individuals with specialized training and physical security backgrounds for identifying, designing and deploying state-of-the-art technology.

The report cited that the current programs for testing, maintaining and repairing alarm systems did not provide adequate assurance that alarms would function when required in an actual security incident. As a result, in fiscal year 1996, the responsibility for security installation was transferred from the Architect of the Capitol to the Capitol Police. In fiscal year 1997, the responsibility for security maintenance was also transferred to the department.

Mr. Taylor. Do you think these operations have improved as a result of the transfers?

Mr. Abrecht. Absolutely. Our ability to focus solely on security concerns within the physical security division has led to some obvious examples of that. The most obvious is the improvement of the duress alarm system. It now sounds an alarm in under 2 seconds, a vast improvement over our previous system which took 30 to 180 seconds to send an alarm from a Member's office when there was some problem in the office.

Or you can look at the deployment of state-of-the-art screening equipment that now accurately screens all of the visitors each day, much of which was in great disrepair at that time and it was antiquated equipment. We replaced most of the sensitive machinery, but yet there is still more to come in the security enhancement plan. But we have made vast improvements in the security as a result of that transfer.

Mr. Livingood. If I may say something, Mr. Chairman, with the transfer, we are spending--we have a group that is spending full-time, as the Chief said, instead of part-time, and the dedication and the ability of this group is phenomenal. For a small group of individuals, they are extremely responsive and are extremely knowledgeable. And I am very proud of what they have done since the transfer by this committee.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Fire Safety

Mr. Taylor. The House Inspector General found more incidences of lack of coordination between the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police in a recent audit of fire safety in the House complex. Do you agree with the findings? Anyone who would like to comment?

Mr. Abrecht. That came as a bit of a surprise to me. We think we have a very good, cooperative relationship with the Architect on fire safety issues primarily in two areas: In the area of fire safety, we have cooperated tremendously, particularly on resolving the problem of fire exits, which is a major issue because, of course, the Architect's concern is for there to be as much egress in the immediate area as possible. And we have a great concern that there not be surreptitious entry.

So there is an obvious rub there. But we have worked very closely with the Architect to resolve that. In fact, we have used our duress alarm system in order to alarm certain doors in the interim before the proper fire exit hardware can be installed so the doors could be unlocked. So we feel we have a pretty good, cooperative relationship on that. And we have worked very closely on the evacuations with the Architect. They worked with us on the Capitol Building Emergency Preparedness Program and are active participants on the Critical Incident Command Group which controls all of the evacuation preparedness for the complex. They participate with us. We work together. I am unaware of any coordination problems that exist.

Mr. Livingood. I would just say from the board's side that the cooperation that we have received from Mr. Hantman has been excellent. It is a pleasure to have him on the board because he can nip things in the bud and move them along much faster.

Crime Statistics

Mr. Taylor. I notice you have a chart with the crimes against persons. Could you explain that?

Mr. Abrecht. We have all of these crimes against persons. The crimes against persons charts, according to the FBI uniform crime reporting definitions of that term for the Capitol ground, which is the line inside the red line here, which is the ground over which the Capitol Police has the primary jurisdiction; and the larger area is the so-called extended jurisdiction zone where we have concurrent jurisdiction, where the primary jurisdiction resides with the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Taylor. And that is up about Union Station, coming across?

Mr. Abrecht. Right around Massachusetts Avenue, that is correct. This is 2nd Street. The south boundary is roughly D Street, basically; and over to 3rd Street is roughly the building. It is basically the grounds of the jurisdiction of the Architect. The larger boundary is 7th Street on the east, H Street on the north, 3rd Street on the west, and goes down as far as P Street, because there are some congressional facilities down in the southern end there that are encompassed in that larger map.

Mr. Pastor. The larger boundary is also extended jurisdiction?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes.

Mr. Pastor. You go up to Eastern Market then?

Mr. Abrecht. We have concurrent jurisdiction with the Metropolitan Police Department out to 7th Street, that is correct.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Go ahead.

Mr. Abrecht. And the dots obviously represent crimes. The red dots are robberies, the yellow dots are homicides, and the green dots are assaults, and the blue dots are sexual assaults. There were no sexual assaults on the grounds during the fiscal year. There were two homicides, which I am sure you were aware of. And there were five robberies and three assaults total during the fiscal year.

Obviously, you can see that in the extended jurisdiction there was a greater level of crime, being a more residential area.

Mr. Taylor. For those of us whose glasses are sort of dirty, could you tell us what the numbers are for the various areas?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes, for the Capitol grounds, during the fiscal year, there were three assaults, two homicides, with which I am sure you are familiar, and five robberies or attempted robberies which are included in that category.

Mr. Taylor. Is attempted robbery, when someone comes up with a weapon and takes possession or is it breaking into cars?

Mr. Abrecht. No, robbery is taking something from a person. So an attempted robbery could be someone pointing a gun at you and your saying, I am not giving you anything or, in this particular case, if I recall correctly, the attempted robbery was an attempt to snatch a purse from a woman who was on the sidewalk on Independence Avenue in front of the Rayburn Building, the guy on a bicycle came by and tried to snatch her purse and failed. And that was an attempted robbery.

Mr. Taylor. What about thefts from cars?
Mr. Abrecht. Those are crimes against properties.
Mr. Taylor. Before we go on to that, what would you say would be the motive for this? Is it drugs or is it just common felons or what do you suspect?
Mr. Abrecht. Obviously, you know the situation of the two homicides. As to the robberies, they were relatively minor street robberies basically, the ones that occurred on the Capitol grounds. The motive is a great sociological question as to why people commit crime. Obviously, I am not sure I am any more qualified than anyone else to speak to that issue. The perpetrators tend to be generally destitute. They are often street people, as you see around town.
Mr. Taylor. If you would go to the crimes against property.
Mr. Abrecht. Yes. The dots are smaller here because the number of them is larger. But, again, I think we are fairly proud of the fact that we, by and large, have been able to keep both property and persons crime off of the grounds of the Capitol itself.
Mr. Taylor. What is the number?
Mr. Abrecht. They were five burglaries on the grounds during the year, 19 stolen automobiles, 42 thefts from auto, 71 office thefts and 78 general thefts, which we do not have broken down any further. Those are generally in the buildings but not in any particular office, like in a hallway.
Mr. Taylor. How does that, both person and property, compare with, for instance, 1993?
Mr. Abrecht. I can tell you that we had substantial reductions over the previous fiscal year in both crimes against persons and crimes against property. I have the exact figures if you would like.
Mr. Taylor. Yes, I would.
Mr. Abrecht. Okay.
[Clerk's note.--Information provided for the record follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. The reason I am asking this is I served on this committee in 1993 and 1994. I remember I was quite impressed by the large number of crimes. And I see today that it is substantially reduced.
Mr. Abrecht. I believe it has been. It tends to fluctuate. I think it follows the election cycle. When you get a new year, a new staff coming, possibly people pay less attention for a little while. And so we have a little more--it seems to me that we have a little more in the fiscal year that follows an election, and then it goes back. So there is a cyclical trend to it.
But I believe it has also actually has gone down overall some. And I could get you the comparison with that year, of course. But I can give you the comparison right now going back 2 fiscal years.
On the Capitol grounds, for instance, and this is the property crimes, we are down 31 percent this year. So we have a very nice reduction in property crimes over the previous year, and a 28.57 reduction in crimes against persons.

Mr. Taylor. And coming from the D.C. committee for 2 years, our new Chief is beginning to address crime here in the District. And I think we have helped the Park Police with their assets to work both with you and with the District Police. I know this is your jurisdiction.

Does that improve your situation?

Mr. Abrecht. Oh, absolutely. Interesting, since you mentioned that, in the extended jurisdiction zone, the green line, which is Chief Ramsey's responsibility, they have a good reduction last year as well. In crimes against persons, they were down 22 percent in the extended jurisdiction; and in crimes against property they were down 19 percent. And so they had a good crime reduction as well.

Mr. Taylor. We took the point of view from our committee, both parties, that D.C., of course, is the Nation's Capitol and not only did we want the Nation's Capitol to have a good record, but it had a definite impact on all our facilities on Capitol Hill. And I am pleased to see that improvements were made, and I am pleased to see that you are working with them.

With the 9 million people coming to the Capitol itself, we are an attractive place for crime against property, I think.

Mr. Abrecht. Right. It is an ongoing problem. Breaking into cars is one of the things that we spend our time making sure it doesn't happen to visitors to the Capitol, because it obviously presents a negative image for the Congress when that happens.

Mr. Taylor. Right. I have some other questions, but I am going to yield to some of our other committee members.

Ed.

Perimeter Security

Mr. Pastor. In a casual conversation yesterday with a new staff person in the Speaker's office, it was mentioned that we were having a problem implementing the security plan in the House.

And so I just ask the question, are we having that problem? And if we are, how can we help you solve it?

Mr. Abrecht. If the plan he was referring to was the perimeter security plan----

Mr. Pastor. Let's start with that one, yeah.

Mr. Abrecht [continuning]. My life is bound by approvals by committees. And there is no question that there is very little we are allowed to do that is not subject to the approval of four committees, generally speaking. And so getting each one of those approvals for this is difficult. The members of the committee and the staff are very busy people, so sometimes it is very difficult to get some of these approvals.

In the case of the perimeter security plan, we have three of the four required approvals; and we are still hoping to get the other one soon.

Mr. Pastor. So he was correct in telling me that we had not implemented the security plan because although three of your four bosses have said okay, we have a problem with one committee not finalizing the approval?

Mr. Abrecht. That is correct. We have been able to implement the Senate portion of that plan, because the Senate--both Senate committees have approved.

Mr. Pastor. How long has this plan been available to be implemented? I am assuming that after the officers had their tragic death that there was a big push to get these security plans done, How long has it been sitting there that we haven't implemented it?

Mr. Abrecht. Let me see. Perimeter security was submitted to the committees on June 16th of 1998, according to your records.

Mr. Pastor. So almost 6, 7 months? Which of your four bosses hasn't approved the plan?

Mr. Abrecht. We are still working with the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. Pastor. House Administration.

Mr. Taylor. In other words, the House Administration, the authorizing committee, hasn't approved it?

Mr. Abrecht. That is correct.

Mr. Taylor. Is there any reason that is apparent?

Mr. Abrecht. None has been communicated to me. I believe Mr. Hantman may have spent more time discussing this with the committee than me since it is primarily a physical security plan.

Mr. Hantman. One of the concerns raised by the committee was how this perimeter security plan interfaces with the Capitol Visitors Center. And we met with the chairman and indicated that the Visitors Center and this perimeter security basically didn't supersede one another, that it is mutually supportive, but the perimeter security could proceed without the visitors center, if necessary. But that may still be a concern.

Mr. Pastor. I think you and I had discussion about an hour ago that it may be at best 7 years from now before we have that Visitor Center. So that means we are going to have engineering plans before we do the security?

Mr. Hantman. Two layouts were prepared, one with the Visitors Center and one without the Visitors Center. There is very little that needs to be changed if we do the perimeter security plan and then the Visitors Center comes in. Very little needs to be changed. Very few dollars to be spent.

Mr. Pastor. I suggest that we implement this perimeter security so we have it in place in the relatively near future. As we worry about the Visitor Center, we at least have some security.

Mr. Taylor. You run a Catch-22 and we will be doing that for years and years.

Mr. Livingood. Mr. Chairman, I also think that the committee was looking at the total security package that we were going to be submitting, so that we have an integrated plan and are looking at the perimeter with the rest of the plan to ensure it is all integrated.

Mr. Pastor. Let me ask you, does that integrated plan include the Visitor Center?

Mr. Livingood. No, sir, it does not.

Mr. Pastor. If we are waiting for the Visitor Center, we are talking at best 7 years from now.

Mr. Livingood. The integrated plan does not include a Visitors Center.

Mr. Pastor. The integrated plan includes the perimeter plus the House itself?

Mr. Livingood. Yes, sir, it includes the entire----

Mr. Abrecht. He was referring to the security enhancement plan that I mentioned earlier. We intend to have that, which is essentially our plan to expend the $106 million that Chairman Taylor was mentioning earlier, our specific plan for all of that, other than the staffing part of it, we expect to have to the committees this week.

Mr. Pastor. Other than personnel, what does it mean? More cameras?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes. There is a whole long----

Mr. Pastor. Oh, okay.

Mr. Abrecht. It is mostly physical security. But it includes new weapons for the officers, new soft body armor, new telecommunications equipment for the department. But it is largely physical security improvements, cameras, new magnetometers, new X-ray equipment.

Mr. Livingood. X-rays.

Mr. Abrecht. And we have not yet submitted that, so that is not on any committee's ticket yet.

Mr. Livingood. That would be forthcoming within the next week.

Mr. Abrecht. The staffing proposal has been with the committee since December, and they have been actively working on that.

Mr. Pastor. Has anything been appropriated for that?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes, it is implemented. There is somewhat of a complex approval process that is required before we can actually spend the money, but we are actively working on that.

Mr. Pastor. Talk about the complexity of the implementation. I think we would probably want you to simplify it so we can be secure, because it is in our interest to have this plan in place. And so I would hope that people who are looking at this would say, let's find a way we can simplify it and get it implemented, because, really, we are hurting ourselves.

Mr. Taylor. And our 9 million guests that come through.

Mr. Pastor. Absolutely,

Mr. Ziglar. Certainly, if I might add, in addition to looking at it from a safety factor, the longer you put off starting something like that, the more it costs--the time value of money.

Mr. Pastor. That is exactly right.

COMPARABILITY PAY

Chief, in your statement, you talk about the need for funding for personnel. And in there you have a statement says part of the money is going to be used to cover the comparison that you are going to make between what you are paying your officers here and as they compare it to outside jurisdictions. Am I right?

Mr. Abrecht. I am not sure--let me just take a quick look at what you are saying exactly.

Mr. Pastor. Okay. It is right here.

Mr. Abrecht. What you are making reference to?

Mr. Pastor. It is the second paragraph, the last sentence:

``In addition, funding is included to cover the anticipated COLA and pay comparability increases.''

Mr. Abrecht. Yes. The pay comparability is really a term of art, Congressman.

Mr. Pastor. You use it well.

Mr. Abrecht. What it refers to is what in the Executive Branch is referred to as locality pay. Because, as you know, if you are a police officer, let's say----

Mr. Pastor. I understand what you are doing. Now, my question is this: Are we having a problem where you are recruiting officers, and once we get them on board, our pay scales are lower than outside jurisdictions, so that we will become a training ground for different police organizations?

Mr. Abrecht. We were. We were. Not any more. Thanks really to the tremendous efforts by this committee----

Mr. Pastor. We were, okay.

Mr. Abrecht [continuing]. Among others, obviously, to resolve that issue for us in the last fiscal year. At the end of the fiscal year, several pay initiatives that the department had been pushing for some time came to fruition thanks to a lot of support on both the authorizing and the appropriating committees on both sides. We were able to get longevity pay for the officers and to get some shift differentials approved that other police departments had.

Mr. Pastor. What about uniforms?

Mr. Abrecht. Pardon me?

Mr. Pastor. Uniforms.

Mr. Abrecht. We furnish all uniforms. We furnish all of our uniforms.

Mr. Pastor. All right.

Mr. Abrecht. And we try very hard to make sure the officers have sharp-looking and fresh uniforms so they present the proper image for the department.

Mr. Pastor. That is not a problem?

Mr. Abrecht. No.

Mr. Pastor. I was worried because maybe we were just becoming a training ground and losing good people, which is an expensive and unproductive prospect.

Mr. Abrecht. There were years when that was a problem, but our attrition has gone down dramatically as a result of the great effort that the committee has put into resolving those discrepancy issues for us last year. And on behalf of the men and women of the force, I would like to thank all of you who worked on that. I know it is not easy. It is never easy to find money for things like that. And we greatly appreciate it.

COMPUTER AND TELECOMMUNICATION EXPENSES

Mr. Pastor. Is there any way you can get the Senate Sergeant at Arms to just forgive the debt that we have on the computer services?

Mr. Abrecht. He has been doing that for a number of years, and I think he is getting tired of it.

Mr. Pastor. In terms of your computer and telecommunications, are we pretty much up to par with what you need and want or are we going to have to borrow some more money from the Senate?

Mr. Abrecht. I am afraid we are not. As you know, the GAO, at the request of the board and the committees, conducted an evaluation of some of our administrative operations, and one of the things they found in fairly dire straits was our information technology area. All of our base programs, things like that, our time and attendance system, our personnel database, our financial management system are very antiquated and are in serious need of replacement. So there is some need for some serious work in the information technology area.

The Senate Sergeant at Arms has been generous over the years in maintaining our operation. But they have really not been able to fund us at a level that would cause a real improvement to be made. And so there is a real need to move in that area.

Mr. Pastor. In this budget you are asking that we pay the Sergeant at Arms?

Mr. Abrecht. No, we really aren't. That is a misnomer. We are asking to become responsible for our own IT and communications. We have been a dependency of the Sergeant at Arms on this, we ought to take our own responsibility for it. We ought to be funded separately from them, and then we will be held responsible. If we screw it up, then you ought to hammer us for it. But we should be in control of our own destiny and have to be accountable for how we spend the taxpayers' money in that regard.

Mr. Ziglar. If I could just make a comment on that. And, obviously, I am new to this job, so I only have a history that I have read or has been told to me. But, over the years, the Senate Sergeant at Arms has provided a lot of the technology, and in the last few years, with the exception of one year, where I guess we put a million and a half into it, we generally have put in about $500,000 to $600,000, on average, each year.

The police force is in bad need of a technological leap forward. And that requires a substantial amount of money well beyond the $500,000 or so that the Senate side has provided each year. I believe that as a business principle having the police department subject to the supervision of the Capitol Police Board, manage its own technology fund and being able to procure the equipment that they really need, as opposed to being forced to use what the Senate has adopted as a technology standard, makes an awful lot of sense.

And, frankly, the Senate is going to have a very difficult time putting anything more than this sort of maintenance level amount that we have provided--and it comes right out of my budget. Plus the fact that I guess I should put on the record that I have been instructed by the Committee on Appropriations on the Senate side to continue to push to have all this technology cost go into the police department budget and taken out of my budget.

But I think just as a common sense matter, and a business matter it makes a lot of sense for the police department to control its own destiny in the technology area. We strongly support that.

EQUIPMENT LIFE-CYCLE REPLACEMENT

Mr. Pastor. My last question goes with your last category, the life cycle replacement. We know that a car or a vehicle has so many years of life. Do you have a plan that says, this year we are going to replace X number of cars and then, next year, et cetera?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes, we do. We try to. Unfortunately, we have fallen a bit behind with the vehicles. We are hoping that some funds may be available out of the security enhancement end to get us caught up on that. But really what we are trying to put primarily on a life cycle replacement is all of this physical security hardware. So we don't get back into the situation that the Congress was in when we took it over, that it had been neglected and not replaced in a timely fashion for so many years that a huge amount of money was required.

The best business practice is to replace a certain amount of this equipment every year so you never have to all of a sudden ask for large sums to replace it all.

Mr. Pastor. Reasonable maintenance?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it.

Physical Threats

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wamp.

Mr. Wamp. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We haven't gotten together as a committee since Officers Gibson and Chestnut gave their lives in our defense, and we are ultimately grateful to them and their families but also grateful to the combined forces of this board, all of you.

I have been proud many times of this institution in the 4 years I have been here but no more proud than I was with the way that we all came together and with the presentations that you two made on behalf of these men and women under you there at that time.

It was truly the best that this institution has ever been. When we were under fire like that, we came together in an unprecedented way.

We hate to lose anybody in any of our forces. I am reminded of my friend Bill Malry who worked for the Clerk's Office and died of a heart attack the night of the State of the Union address. I spoke to him that night, and I did not know until earlier today that he passed away. Nobody got word to me. But he was a great friend and a great guy. We called him Slim, those of us who talked to him on a daily basis. He worked for the Clerk's Office, not the Sergeant at Arms, but he was another one who gave more than three decades of service in the Capitol day in and day out, and that means everything. I gave Slim a shirt for Christmas, and I hope he wore it before he died.

These are the times when you are appreciated so much, and I want to thank you again today on behalf of this committee. And I think that the pay equities issues are the very least that we can do, given the sacrifices that you all make. Again, we think of those families that have been affected.

The Threats Task Force, I want to commend them, too. That doesn't mean much to a Member of Congress until they have had a physical threat made against them, and then the Threats Task Force is very germane.

I have a hard time differentiating what is held for executive session and what is public, so I will be careful when I ask questions when the world is watching or in an open meeting like this, but how is that going?

And in response to what Mr. Pastor said about the problems with our perimeter plan not being approved yet, not that the Botanic Garden being included in the emergency supplemental was ever a good precedent to set. And I don't think that was a good precedent to set, but if you look at that as a precedent, what could be more of an emergency than us getting our act together with our perimeter plan of this Capitol with 9 million people?

Our security plan worked when Officers Gibson and Chestnut gave their lives because they were there as a deterrent. But it also tells us what is left to do. We need to make sure that the officer is not the first thing that a bad person comes in contact with, and that means getting this perimeter plan executed in a timely manner. I would think our safety and health is at risk until we do that. And so I would appeal that it be classified as a real emergency to put a little emotion behind this request, that this is serious business. I also ask you how the Threats Task Force is coming along.

Mr. Abrecht. I think we are doing an increasingly good job. We have better intelligence-gathering capabilities. Our relationship with the intelligence agencies of the Executive Branch, the CIA and those groups, have never been better. We have recently detailed an officer to work directly in the State Department so we will have better capability to prepare for congressional travel abroad and to have interface with their intelligence-gathering capabilities throughout the world. So I think we are in good shape in that area.

The threats themselves were essentially even. We had roughly the same number in fiscal year 1998 as we had in fiscal year 1997.

Some other categories are going up. Implied threats and nuisance calls, these are continuing to increase. The level of work for the threat assessment section is continuing to increase, but direct threats against Members of Congress is essentially static over the last 2 years.

Mr. Wamp. A lot of people don't take that seriously enough. If the general public knew that when you make a physical threat to a Member of Congress, it is serious business. If you are a family member or a Member of Congress, we are not any different than anybody else. Those threats are taken seriously by you, and if people knew that it was serious, maybe they would be less inclined to do it, and it would be on the decline instead of static.

Mr. Abrecht. You are correct. When the FBI goes and knocks on these people's door, they say, I didn't mean to harm congressman so and so; I was just venting my spleen. We say, that is not an appropriate way to vent your spleen. They are remorseful in many cases, and we never hear from them again.

But it is a concern when people get aggressive in writing or in telephone conversations. E-mail has become a new way to do this, and so the number coming over e-mail has vastly increased.

Mr. Livingood. It is a felony. Every one of them is investigated seriously.

Another thing, the speed has increased with which these threats are investigated, and I give a lot of credit to the Capitol Police threat section for that and the FBI. They have picked up the investigative portion of this and run with it immediately.

Retirement Pay

Mr. Wamp. I think there is a bill floating around by Mr. Traficant about changing the retirement age for the Capitol Police. Have you taken a position on that or plan to?

Mr. Abrecht. For years the Capitol Police sought to have one thing, which was to have a retirement system that was the same as Federal law enforcement. This was before my time. We were granted that. It is our position that we are very thankful for that, and we would like to remain wherever Federal law enforcement is. If Congress decides that they want to take a look at the whole issue of mandatory retirement for Federal law enforcement and change that for everybody, then we would support that.

But our position is that we really wish to remain part of the Federal law enforcement retirement system, and I don't believe that that would be possible and also to carve out this little exception for just us.

Bulletproof Vests and Weapons

Mr. Wamp. So it is like the pay issue. Equity is your goal across the board, and includes pay and benefits. Speaking of that, will every Capitol police officer who wants a bulletproof vest have one?

Mr. Abrecht. Every Capitol police officer already has a bulletproof vest. The security enhancement fund will get them a newer, higher quality vest, hopefully one with more wearability.

There has been some improvements in that technology since we acquired the ones that we currently have which will make wearing them on the plaza in July less oppressive and we will feel more comfortable in requiring the officers to wear them. That is one of the things that we are looking for, in addition to higher ballistic resistance characteristics.

Mr. Wamp. We are grateful to all of you.

Mr. Abrecht. I am tremendously grateful to the Congress for the way that they reacted after the shootings. The way that Congress came together and the support that we received in so many different ways, including the great honor paid our officers to lie in the Rotunda, is something that has really impressed the force and moved me greatly. And since you are the Congress before me this afternoon, I thank you.

Mr. Livingood. I, too, as an observer and being at the scene, saw the coming together of this Congress, the Capitol Police, the staff and everyone. I particularly thank on mybehalf the two committees that I work for, House Administration and this committee, both staff and members from that committee were there instantly. What can we do for you? Can we help in any way?

When you are in the midst of things, that is a tremendous support. It makes you feel comfortable. It reassures you that you are doing the right thing, and it was welcomed by all of us.

Mr. Taylor. Let me follow up a little. There is adequate funding for the new vests?

Mr. Abrecht. Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor. When do you think the new procurement will be had?

Mr. Abrecht. The security enhancement plan proposal will be received by the committees this week. As soon as that is approved, we will actually be able to do the procuring. We are not waiting until that time to identify the model that we would like to buy and all of that. That is ongoing. So as soon as the funding is actually released to us, we anticipate within a very short period of time we will be able to do the procuring. We are putting together the procurement request at the present time in anticipation of receiving the approval.

Mr. Taylor. What about for new side arms?

Mr. Abrecht. We have decided what caliber of weapon we would like to move to. We were looking at two basic ways to procure those. One would be to put out an RFB, request for bids. Another way would be that one of the large Federal Executive Branch law enforcement agencies went through a very expensive process to identify a weapon and issued some bids. It is possible for other agencies to piggyback onto that so we are looking at the possibility of short-circuiting this process by purchasing additional weapons off of that bid and thereby vastly shortening the time line to get the weapons on board.

Mr. Taylor. Any time we can save money is commendable. However, at the same time you may have different needs.

Mr. Abrecht. We are going to look at all of that.

Mr. Taylor. I have heard that some of the officers might have to cannibalize their weapons to get enough spare parts to operate, and I am not going to ask if that is true or not, but obviously how long will it take, do you think, for us to procure the new weapons? Are we talking about the same thing for the vests and so forth? Are we going to be waiting on the six committees or whatever, to get together and so forth?

Mr. Abrecht. Before we can actually spend the money the committees do have to approve, but I don't imagine that the committees are going to want to get into the nitty-gritty of what brand of weapon that we are going to want to purchase. We are expecting by the summer we will have these weapons in hand.

Mr. Taylor. What are those committees again?

Mr. Abrecht. House Administration, this committee, and the two Senate Committees: Rules and Administration and Senate Legislative Branch Appropriations.

Mr. Taylor. All right.

Here again, I think it behooves us, Mr. Pastor and myself, to get together with our leadership and those committees to see, as we were talking about doing with the Visitor Center, if we can give ourselves a much faster time line. In matters such as this, waiting beyond the criteria evaluation of the guns or the vests, to spend more weeks trying to get together is certainly endangering our officers and our guests, and we are as responsible as any of the committees, so we are not pointing to any one.

Let's see, a few other questions that we have. I wanted to have you explain the need for the request for $1.8 million to transfer to the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Abrecht. That was a computer item that Mr. Pastor brought up.

Mr. Ziglar. It is to put it in their budget for that computer and other technology support. The Senate is not requesting repayment. But if you want to repay it----

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, do you have any other questions?

Mr. Pastor. No, I don't think so. Thank you.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Evaluation of Administrative Operations

Question. Recently, the GAO undertook an evaluation of your administrative operation, including financial management, human resources, and information management. Please outline those areas where they indicated improvement is needed.

Response. The Board has been briefed by the staff of the General Accounting Office and has had an opportunity to review a draft report provided by the consultant, Booz-Allen and Hamilton. However, the final report has not been provided to the Board.

Generally, the consultant found that the United States Capitol Police is receiving the necessary support services from its administrative infrastructure, but that infrastructure is fragile and unlikly to be able to provide adequate service in the future with changes in strategy, organization, and business processes. Noted areas for improvement gleaned from the briefing process include: Reorganization of the Department's administrative functions under a new position of Assistant Chief for Administration; Development of a strategic plan for infrastructure support; Development and execution of a plan for reviewing, documenting, and distributing policies and procedures for all support activities.

Question. Specifically, outline what actions have been taken since the findings of this study were presented to the Board.

Response. As previously stated, the findings of the study have only been provided to the Board in preliminary form. Nevertheless, steps have been taken to begin moving toward implementation of the consultant's recommendations.

Funding was requested and approved in the Omnibus Appropriations bill to permit hiring of a consultant to assist in the development of the Department's strategic plan.

A draft reorganization plan, along the lines of that recommended by the consultant, has been developed.

New position requirements needed to rectify identified staffing and skill deficiencies which were noted by the consultant in the areas of financial management, information management, and human resources management have been identified, classified and transmitted to the appropriate committees of the House and Senate for approval.

Policy review, in contrast with those of benchmark agencies identified by the consultant, is underway. A determination has been made to transfer existing administrative policy documents from their place in the Department's overall policy and procedure manual into a separate administrative manual, as recommended by the consultant. Existing policies will be revised, reformatted into a more understandable form, and reinforced with new policies and procedures identified through the review and benchmark process.

An improved personnel evaluation process has been drafted and is under study by department human resources personnel. However, this process contrasts from that recommended by the consultant in some significant areas that will require careful consideration and reconciliation.

The Board is scheduling an off-site conference in the first week of March to thoroughly review, among other issues, the Department's business processes. The consultant's report and recommendations will be central to these discussions.

Comparison of FY 99 and FY 2000 Budget Estimates

Question. The salaries budget is up by $4.4 million (from $76.8 to $81.2 million). Most of this is for the routine COLA's, and the annualized items. But there is $1.3 million for a ``base pay'' adjustment. Explain that.

Response. Amounts appropriated for fiscal year 1999 allowed for historical lapse rates in employment of officers and civilians. The FY99 appropriation was further reduced by $422,000 on the basis of savings that accrue when hiring a recruit to replace an officer. The FY 2000 estimate for base salaries was prepared using the actual salaries of 1,251 incumbents on board. The estimate has not been adjusted for lapse in that the Department anticipates virtually no retirement activity due to the revision to the longevity pay scale.

Question. The general expense budget is up $2.8 million. There is a 37% (+$204,000) increase in the ``transportation of persons'' budget. Explain that increase.

Response. The total increase requested for transportation of persons is $204,000. Of this amount, $126,000 is requested to cover the travel costs associated with the political conventions scheduled for July and August of the year 2000. Of the total amount requested, $551,000 is for the Dignitary Protection Division personnel assigned to protective details by the Capitol Police Board. The amount of $138,000 is requested for travel associated with professional and specialized training. This estimate represents about $110 per FTE per year. It is the position of the Capitol Police Board that training is essential to a professional and prepared police force.

Question. How many of our police will be needed at the conventions?

Response. It is somewhat difficult to gauge manpower for events this far in the future. Much depends upon the site and the threat level at the time. However, based on the 1996 numbers in San Diego and Chicago, I would expect staffing levels to be in the neighborhood of 30 for each event. That number includes post standers, Intelligence agents, Officials, and agents assigned to leadership protection. We used 26 in San Diego and 25 in Chicago in 1996.

Question. For the record, provide a list of all trips charged to this budget item, the purpose of each trip, the number of police personnel traveling, and a summary of the expense items.

Response. In the aggregate, the Department expended $442,545 in fiscal year in support of its dignitary protection mandate. This encompassed 462 total trips and involved 1,995 staff travel days. The Department would be pleased to brief the committee on other details of this function at their convenience, but considers much of the data to be law enforcement sensitive.

Question. For the record, itemize the $926,000 decrease in ``other services'', and list the identity, number, and cost of the life cycle replacement items in the ``capital asset'' budget. Describe the age and condition if the items you intend to replace.

Response. The amount of $500,000 as appropriated in the General Expenses account to reimburse amounts used to cover overtime in fiscal year 1998. This amount was eliminated in the FY 2000 request. Further, start-up costs for a hazardous materials program totaling $160,000 in FY 99 are not recurring. Other offsets include funds provided for one-time miscellaneous repairs and acquisitions.

While we had requested 1.6M in FY99 for the physical security life-cycle replacement program, 1.2M was ultimately funded.

The funding received by the Capitol Police allows for the replacement of existing security systems and equipment that is failing and obsolete. This program is a continuation of existing initiatives to replace security equipment as it reaches the end of its usable life cycle and to procure additional systems for new requirements, while continuing an orderly security equipment upgrade program. It prevents the need for wholesale replacement of security systems through no-year funding by establishing a fully funded physical security program. Replacing security equipment as it reaches the end of its usable life cycle will avoid long down times for repairs or failure during critical events.

This program also attempts to continuously update security equipment as new technology becomes available. Typical equipment that will be replaced in this program are X-ray machines, weapons detectors, bomb detection systems, access control, and intrusion detection systems. As new security equipment is installed, it is important that it be maintained and placed on a planned life-cycle replacement program. In doing so, we can ensure our physical security systems are always fully operational and that we can methodically purchase equipment and keep pace with advancement in security technology.

Also attached are the vehicles in need of replacement in FY 2000.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Again, I would say that we appreciate your being here and your cooperation, and we will be working with you through the remainder of this session and markup, and we will be calling on you probably again if we can.

Thank you very much. And for the record please supply all of the reprogramming requests made last year and disposition of each of the appropriations committees.

This committee is now adjourned.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

Facilities

Question. What new training facilities does the Capitol Police need, and how soon do they need them?

Response. The Architect of the Capitol has contracted a consultant, EDAW, to prepare a facilities master plan for the United States Capitol Police that will identify, among other facility needs, the Department's training facility requirements. Phase One of this project began in October, 1998, and includes the following activities: developing facility requirements and performing asset evaluations; preparing alternatives and a concept plan; preparing draft and final reports; and preparing briefings and brochures.

Question. What improvements are needed to the USCP's current training facilities, short--or long term?

Response. The facilities master plan is expected to identify short and long term improvement needs. In the very short term, the Department has requested a temporary expansion of its training facility in the Ford House Office Building to accommodate an anticipated staffing level increase of 215 officers.

Question. What training facilities upgrades, if any can be funded from last year's $106-million security-enhancement appropriation?

Response. Last year's security enhancement appropriation included funding of $1 million for the design of a police training facility. The design product will include completed construction drawings, specifications and a cost estimate for a new police training facility.

Question. What existing facilities under the control of Congress or other entities are you considering as possible ways to meet these training needs, if any?

Response. The facilities master plan will include a number of site recommendations for a training facility. Presently, properties owned, leased or managed by the Federal and District governments are being considered, as are properties owned by commercial or private interests.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WITNESSES

JAMES H. BILLINGTON, THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS
DONALD L. SCOTT, DEPUTY LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS
WINSTON TABB, ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN FOR LIBRARY SERVICES
RUBENS MEDINA, LAW LIBRARIAN
JO ANN C. JENKINS, CHIEF OF STAFF, OFFICE OF THE LIBRARIAN
LINDA WASHINGTON, DIRECTOR, INTEGRATED SUPPORT SERVICES
KENNETH E. LOPEZ, DIRECTOR OF SECURITY
HERBERT S. BECKER, DIRECTOR, INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY SERVICES
MARYBETH PETERS, REGISTER OF COPYRIGHTS
DANIEL P. MULHOLLAN, DIRECTOR, CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE
FRANK KURT CYLKE, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICE FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED
BEN BENITEZ, ACTING DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF THE ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN FOR HUMAN RESOURCES SERVICES
JOHN D. WEBSTER, DIRECTOR, FINANCIAL SERVICES
KATHY A. WILLIAMS, BUDGET OFFICER

Opening Remarks

Mr. Taylor. Since this is a single vote, I would like to ask Dr. Billington with his staff to come and be seated, and we will go and vote while you are being seated, and we will come right back. It shouldn't take more than a couple of minutes. We are in recess.

[Recess.]

Mr. Taylor. The committee will come back to order. We will now take up the Library of Congress. We want to welcome Dr. James Billington, the Librarian of Congress, and also welcome retired General Donald Scott, the Deputy Librarian of Congress.

BUDGET REQUEST

The 2000 budget of the Library assumes total funds available will be $567.3 million from a variety of sources, including appropriated funds, receipts, gifts, trust and revolving funds and the reimbursable program. The direct appropriations request before the committee today is $416.8 million, and that is an increase of some $25.1 million or 6.4 percent over the current level. This level of resources includes $33.1 million in offsetting collections.

The Library is requesting funding for 82 additional employees but plans to assume these positions within their current FTE level. The current level is 4,076 permanent FTEs.

Dr. Billington, would you like to introduce your staff and proceed with any comments you would like to make?

Dr. Billington. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

In addition to myself as Librarian of Congress; General Scott, the Deputy Librarian; Winston Tabb, Associate Librarian for Library Services; Rubens Medina, the Law Librarian of Congress; Jo Ann C. Jenkins, the Chief of Staff, Office of the Librarian; Linda Washington, Director of Integrated Support Services; Kenneth E. Lopez, our Director of Security; Herbert S. Becker, the Director of Information Technology Services; Marybeth Peters, Register of Copyrights; Daniel P. Mulhollan, the Director of Congressional Research Service; Frank Kurt Cylke, Director, National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped; Ben Benitez, Acting Director, Office of the Associate Librarian for Human Resources Services; John D. Webster, Director of Financial Services; and Kathy A. Williams, Budget Officer.

LIBRARIAN'S STATEMENT

I am happy to begin by responding to your questions, Mr. Chairman. We have submitted, of course, a fairly full statement, perhaps even more than you would want. So I and my colleagues would be happy to respond to your questions right from the beginning.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We have circulated your statement, and it will be printed as part of the record.

[The prepared statement of Dr. Billington follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Transition to Digital Formats

Mr. Taylor. Your statement highlights that the Library is making a transition from paper and related forms to digital formats. Explain how you are making that transition.

Dr. Billington. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the more exciting aspects of the Library of Congress as we prepare for our third century of existence as the Nation's oldest federally-mandated cultural institution, the largest repository of knowledge and creativity in the world. Because it is no longer just the books, the tapes, the movies, and the maps, most of which we have the largest collections in existence. It is also the electronic world that is coming into being. Not only is the Library a large collection, approaching 116 million artifactual objects used here in the buildings on Capitol Hill, the three buildings on Capitol Hill, but it is also an electronic library that is available 24 hours a day to every

State of the Nation and localities.

We are getting close to three and a half million electronic transactions now every working day. It is increasing dramatically. I think these aids are in your package, attached to the statement. But the Library is collecting not only the ever-increasing artifacts--people don't realize the production of books increased more than 6 percent last year--but also this exploding electronic world that is coming in to being.

Now, we have a plan. We are asked, how is the Library going to get there? How are we going to integrate the emerging electronic materials and the ever-increasing traditional materials? We are really working in two areas, getting access to the entire digital universe, not just that which the Library is digitizing but that which is created in exclusively digital form. As much as a fifth of the world's legal production now is available only in electronic form, as our Law Librarian informs us.

Five Year Plan

So, acquiring the digital collection at the same time as reengineering our traditional functions involves a lot of technology as well, but, basically, we are getting the two collections blended together. In the next 5 years, of the new century, we will be trying to assure that first and foremost, the Congress and, second, the people of America have access not just to a wholly reengineered traditional collection made available largely through this integrated library system that the Congress was so generous with last year, but also to the Librarys increased storage of digital information produced by others as well as the increasing amount of digital information that we are creating.

Our goal, of course, is to be able to provide traditionally what we have always done, but in new ways that integrate both the traditional and the artifactual, the physical objects and the new network electronic information.

We want to have at the end of this period of development a new, dual capacity which integrates the two, making the Library a one-stop shopping for the end user. We want to have usable material for a democratic government through the Congress. That is our first priority.

Secondly, we want to make available locally throughout the country the memory and imagination material for all Americans, especially for young Americans, a development which has proved so exciting for the K through 12 population. And, finally, of course, we want to have as seamless a navigation method as possible in a secure environment.

Automation Building Blocks

Those are very traditional objectives which we now have on a much-expanded scale. What we are asking for this year, are all of the different initiatives transitioning to the next phase. What you see here--the top two are solely the digital collections: the Legislative Information System for the Congress and the National Digital Library which goes out to your constituents.

Below, you have the Integrated Library System and the Electronic Cataloging Publication System, which reengineer the traditional processes. The three in the middle serve both the digital collections and the reengineered traditional processes, and for those three, we are asking for modest increases in this year's budget submission, which net a 5.5 percent increase overall.

But the principal initiatives where we need further help this year are the Global Legal Information Network, which gets the Law Library connected so that we have in realtime law codes and law materials from foreign countries, to be able to serve the Congress and the country in that way.

The CORDS, the electronic registration system for copyrights, becomes something that ordinary users can easily access electronically, to simplify that function, and, finally, electronic resources, which is the largest need, so that we can store and make available to the Congress and the Nation the enormous amount of material that is only being produced in digital form.

We are trying to bring that all together and at the same time, sustain our traditional services. That, in brief, Mr. Chairman, is how we hope to satisfy this need to bring the two together.

It is important to stress that we cannot disregard the traditional services while we develop new electronic ones. By combining the two together, I think, we have a chance to make the Library far more usable both to the Congress and to the American people generally.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. It has been my experience over the 6 years I have been on the Appropriations Committee that the Library has done an excellent job in trying to accomplish this, and with limited funds. I understand that we all could spend more money perhaps, if we had it, but I would like to commend you.

General Scott, the transition will create the need and opportunity for the Library to reengineer the traditional way of providing information and services. What capability do you have on your staff to look for cost savings during this effort?

Reengineering Program

General Scott. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As Dr. Billington just pointed out, we do have a number of initiatives underway that will require reengineering of our processes to ensure that we can keep up the high-quality service to our customers. We have an excellent planning schedule, and I would say that we are world class in that effort.

Within the next 5 years, there is an opportunity for us to be able to reengineer and, at the same time, look for some cost savings as we do this. We need individuals who have the right expertise and background in business reengineering who could work for the Library for a limited period of time, like 5 years, to help us look for these opportunities to save as we reengineer.

Mr. Taylor. Please let us know how we can help in that area.

ILS Project

Could you give us an update of the Integrated Library System project?

General Scott. Yes, sir. The Integrated Library System, which the Congress approved for us over 2 years ago, is on track. It is scheduled to be implemented October 1999. We have met all of the milestones that we have briefed Congress about; and, in fact, our most recently forwarded report that was delivered to the Congress on the 29th of January. That report lays out everything that we have done and what we have to accomplish between now and October 1999.

Off-site Storage

Mr. Taylor. Next year you plan to occupy a new off-site facility that is being built at Fort Meade, I believe. Can you explain that project to us?

General Scott. Yes, sir. The Fort Meade project consists of constructing modules to house the additional books and periodicals that we don't have room for here on Capitol Hill.

The first module is scheduled to be completed--according to the Architect of the Capitol--in July 2000 and will house approximately 2.2 million books and periodicals.

The second module will have a 2.8 million volume capacity.

We have selected a design that will provide an efficient method of retrieving those lesser-used collections for researchers who request them.

Mr. Taylor. You would use your contract support to operate that building?

General Scott. Yes, Mr. Chairman. We have thought very carefully about the use of contract labor to operate that facility; and, of course, we would only do it if it proved to be in the best interest of the government.

Mr. Taylor. Okay. I have several questions, but let me open it to other members of the committee.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Fort Meade

Question. Next year, you plan to occupy a new off-site storage facility that is being built at Fort Meade. Please explain that project.

Response. We have four primary objectives for off-site storage: providing an efficient method of storing lesser-used collections, providing an environment to ensure the long-term preservation of these collections, ensuring efficient and timely retrieval of requested items, and vacating leased collections storage space.

The Library plans to start occupying the new Fort Meade book storage facility in the summer of 2000, about one month after the Architect of the Capitol completes construction. We plan to occupy the second book storage facility in fiscal 2001, a third book storage facility in fiscal 2003, and a fourth book storage facility in fiscal 2004. We also plan to occupy a copyright deposits facility and a screening/holding facility in fiscal 2004, and a warehouse facility in fiscal 2005.

This book storage project consists of constructing sequential, adjoining modules to accommodate growth of the Library's collections which can no longer be accommodated on Capitol Hill. The first module will house approximately 2.2 million books and bound periodicals. We anticipate that the first module will be filled within 550 work days or approximately 2\1/2\ years after occupancy--meaning, if Module #1 is ready for occupancy in the summer of 2000, it will be full by November 2002.

The Library's fiscal 1999 funds will purchase items that have a long procurement lead-time and items that need to be logically incorporated into facility construction, such as specialized equipment and supplies, and security equipment. The fiscal 2000 funds will be used to purchase equipment and supplies that have a shorter procurement lead time and begin to fund the actual operation of the facility, e.g., contract staff to transfer material from Capitol Hill to Ft. Meade, to operate Module #1 at Ft. Meade, and to clean and maintain the facility.

Question. Will you use contract support to operate that building? If not, it should be possible to use part time staff from local colleges, as Harvard and other schools have found useful. Will you look into that?

Response. We have and will continue to consider this option. Our plan is to contract the operation of this facility if it proves in the best financial interest of the government to do so. The specific mix and source of the staff will be the discretion of the contractor, and will be such that the contractor will be able to meet the contractor requirements we specify. The use of part-time student help may or may not be considered practical by a contractor because Fort Meade is not adjacent to a college.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you.

Reengineering

You talked about the reengineering. I am assuming that deals with personnel?

General Scott. Not completely. That is a part of the effort.

Mr. Pastor. What are we talking about?

General Scott. We are also talking about reengineering processes of how we catalog and inventory. We are talking about reengineering the processes that incorporate, for example, how we receive the material, process it, tag it, and code it.

Mr. Pastor. In other agencies they have talked about reengineering, but they also talked about personnel needs. You have people with unique talents. But as you look to do different things, sometimes the talents that personnel have, don't match. Then, you have people now who are leaving, and so you have to look for the short-term present time and then to the future. So I think it deals with personnel changes, and what are you doing about that as you reengineer everything else?

General Scott. You are quite correct. We are looking at how we train and develop staff currently doing the work and then to come up with ways that we can retrain people to do different work. That is part of the reengineering package, that we currently have the expertise in-house to do that, and we are currently doing that.

Mr. Pastor. So you have to do in-house training?

General Scott. Yes. We are conducting in-house training through our internal university.

As far as personnel changes, we are also currently reviewing our entire human resources system to identify how we might streamline and make that faction more efficient. However, I don't want to get too far ahead of the process. What we are currently doing can be accommodated in-house with the people that we have.

Mr. Pastor. Am I understanding that you are not adding any new personnel positions but you are changing the type of FTE position?

Full-time Equivalents

General Scott. We don't expect to have to hire a great number of new people, because the objective is to take the people that we currently have, whose job may need to be shifted and where we can find a match to retrain people to do that. So the emphasis will be on retraining employees that we currently have.

Dr. Billington. One thing, the funding for the 82 FTE's we are requesting this year, would not exceed the current budget level. The Library is operating at a level slightly below the FTE's approved by the Committee, primarily due to higher average salary costs.

Let me say as a general point on this, there are two big issues. We have lost 591 positions since 1992, 13 percent of our staff. We are getting a lot more work done with less people already.

We face really two problems, slash, opportunities. But there are other problems. There is very little turnover in the workforce, so we have a rather aging workforce. Forty-five percent of them are going to be eligible to retire by the middle of the next decade.

We also have an enormous need, because of these technology changes, to retool people from doing sort of repetitive work into being knowledge navigators. We have got to serve you properly in the future. We are going to have to be able to deal with this enormous flood of material that is coming on the Internet plus the explosion of publishing around the world. There will be a lot more players in international politics and international economics.

In order to keep up with that, we are going to have to continue to acquire all this material and make it accessible, we are going to need people who are skilled navigators, who can help guide you and who can help provide objective navigation through this great explosion of knowledge and information which results from this economic expansion. Many of our exports are in knowledge-based industries. This is a big training and retraining job.

This involves necessarily a succession plan which is part of our proposal this year, so that the invaluable knowledge of the current staff who have been with us a long time, gets transmitted to other people. We have got to retrain people, to make it possible for our very skilled people to move into the knowledge navigation business and to get the added training that they may need. We are going to hire a lot of people, and this is going to put a lot of strain on the personnel system.

General Scott and others are working on this, and we think it is an enormous opportunity. It is also going to be a key part of the whole reengineering process so that, at the end of this, we will have new people, but we also will have the knowledge transmitted by their predecessors, not just lost with their retirement. That is why the succession plan is important.

And we are going to have to retrain a lot of the very talented people we currently have. We are going to have to find imaginative ways to do this in view of our limited training budget.

We think this mentoring process will help, and a thorough study of the human side of reengineering is definitely a key part of our thinking.

Mr. Pastor. So the 82 positions that we talk about in this budget----

General Scott. Right.

Mr. Pastor [continuing]. They are positions that you have in place presently, they are unfilled, and basically you want to change or reclassify them so you can implement them in your reengineering program?

General Scott. No, sir.

Mr. Pastor. These are all new positions?

General Scott. No. Now I clearly understand what the question is. We are not talking about the ability to increase by 82 FTEs. What we are talking about here is that since we didn't get all of our mandatories for last year, that means that in order just to stay somewhat close to the 4,076 FTEs as authorized, that we need to have the additional money to keep close to that. And, we still will not exceed the 4,076 FTEs.

Mr. Pastor. Okay. One more question. Security was a problem a few years back, and I know that monies have been appropriated for securing the collections in the Library and making sure people aren't taking books or tearing books or whatever they were doing. Where are we on that and where do we still need to go?

Collections Security

General Scott. Well, we did receive considerable assistance from a special appropriation from Congress, basically to improve our perimeter security. So those plans are still in the process of being finalized.

With respect to the internal security that we were working on last year, we have made significant progress. We do have a security plan now that we are implementing; and within that security plan the money we are asking for in this year's budget is for help to expand our current reader registration.

This will require that all researchers who come to the Library of Congress get a library card that would be part of a data bank. This will enable us to know who is there and what their needs are. It also permits the reader ease of access into the reading rooms.

We also have found that the registration helps the reading rooms because it gives staff, who man the reading rooms, immediate access to information about the reader.

We are asking for money to extend these reader registration programs to the Madison Building. This program is currently being implemented in the Jefferson and the Adams. So we think this will help us to reduce the risk of people coming in and us not knowing who they are.

The other piece needed to improve security is the marking, tagging and bar coding of material that comes in. The Congress approved and funded marking and tagging for copyright items in fiscal 1999, and we think that we need to have additional money to help us to expand the marking and tagging program to include acquisitions through gifts, exchanges and purchases.

Then, finally, the money we are asking for is to help us make sure that we monitor the collections that come out of a secure area and then go into the reading rooms. If we had some additional security monitors, it would help to maintain contact with people who take these rare books or precious items, and we can see what they are doing in that regard.

So that is the additional $1.4 million we are asking for in this particular budget. That is what it will be used for.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follow:]

Question. There is a $1.4 million item for improved collection security. Explain that program. How many budget years will be affected? What will the overall cost be?

Response. This program covers three critical collections security program areas: reader registration, security of collections while in use, and marking, tagging, and bar coding.

The reader registration portion of the program will cost $466,791 (funding for 8 FTEs) in fiscal 2000 and continues into the out years. The Library's Security Plan specifies, as a minimum standard, the identification of all patrons requesting material from the collections. The current program is limited to Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings' reading rooms; this additional funding expands the current program to the James Madison Building reading rooms. To date, approximately 130,000 cards have been issued.

The marking, tagging, and bar coding portion of the program will cost $476,378 (in material and supplies) in fiscal 2000 and continues into the out years. The Library's Security Plan specifies, as a minimum standard, the marking and tagging of most material. The Congress approved and funded the marking and tagging of materials received via copyright deposit starting in fiscal 1999. This request will expand marking and tagging to other sources of acquisitions (i.e., gifts, exchanges, purchases).

The security of collections while in use portion of the program will cost $409,032 (funding for one FTE and contract support) in fiscal 2000 and continues into the out years. The Library is requesting $370 thousand in contractual services funding to improve the enforcement of security standards by placing security monitors in five additional reading rooms. Contract security monitors are now used in the Manuscript and Main reading rooms. We are asking that this successful program be expanded to five other reading rooms where unique materials often of great value are used: Law, Geography & Map, Music, Prints & Photographs, and Rare Books.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wamp.

Mr. Wamp. So how many FTEs do you have now total? How many people?

Dr. Billington. I believe it is 4,076.

Mr. Wamp. Well, let me say that I am proud of those 4,076 and certainly both of you as leaders of the Library of Congress. Very few things do I enjoy as much as the Library of Congress, both physically and in terms of the research that I access, as well as just the ability to check books out and read them on a regular basis.

I was going to approach the grading of the workforce issue, but you covered it pretty well. Just to clarify, this 5.5 percent increase, most of it, maybe like 80 percent of it, is required pay raises?

General Scott. Right.

Mr. Wamp. The rest of it just a thin slice, $3.5 million or so, right, and that is it----

General Scott. Yes.

Mr. Wamp [continuing]. Basically? So with inflation factored in, you are not even asking for an increase, is that right?

General Scott. That is correct.

Mr. Wamp. This is pretty much a maintenance budget for the next year, even though we are approaching--and this is what I want you to do during my 5 minutes--the great bicentennial of this incredible natural asset. So how about whetting our appetite just a little bit, give us a sneak preview of where we are headed next year with this great, grand 200 year celebration of the Library of Congress?

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follow:]

Largest Source of the Fiscal 2000 Budget Increase

Question. Overall, the Library is requesting a total appropriation of $16.9 million ($16,905,618) in the various accounts for mandatory pay items and price-levels changes. Is that primarily for the cost-of-living and increase in the President's budget and the normal price increases for printing, travel and the like?

Response. Yes, that is correct; $13.9 million is for pay increases and $3.0 million is for inflation on non-personal categories of expense.

Workstation Replacement as a Growing Workload Increase

Question. So the balance of the increase is $8.2 million for workload items? One of these items is $4.2 million for automation projects and $1.6 million is for the staff succession program. What about the $1.5 million for the workstation replacements? How many work stations and how long will that take? What is the overall cost of the project?

Response. Approximately 2,200 workstations will be replaced over a five-year period. The 2,200 workstations represent about 70 percent of the staff located in the Madison Building. The total cost of the replacement project is $10,889,000. We plan to use $650,000 a year for five years (a total of $3,250,000) of our Furniture and Furnishings base toward this priority program. The total five-year amount requested from Congress is $7,640,000.

Question. Is this just to bring these workstations up to date?

Response. Yes, twenty years ago, when the James Madison Building was built, typical office furniture was designed to accommodate the use of standard typewriters and manual tasks. This program will replace the original furniture with efficient and flexible workstations designed specifically and ergonomically to accommodate modern desktop computers as staff spend more and more time working on their computer. The workstations in the Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings either have been or are currently being updated as part of that renovation project.

Question. What productivity gains should we expect to see from this program?

Response. The existing furniture does not perform well in a personal computer environment. The new workstations are expected to provide enhanced productivity by making more job tools readily accessible. The real gain from ergonomic workstations will be the efficiency of movement and reduced stress from repetitive movements. The Library has already experienced a reduction in work related injuries in areas where ergonomic workstations have been established:

CARPAL TUNNEL SYNDROME COSTS VS. TOTAL COSTS

	1996		1997	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Perc
Carpal Tunnel................................	$214,296	20.7	$147,498	1
All other....................................	820,570	79.3	994,674	8
Total..................................	1,034,866		1,142,172	

Bicentennial Commemoration

General Scott. That is for the maestro.

Dr. Billington. Well, I will say a few things; and then maybe Jo Ann Jenkins, who is the Chief of Staff, may want to add something.

Briefly, we are going to start this June. At the beginning of the century, the Congress commissioned the Library of Congress at the St. Louis World's Fair, to summon the greatest thinkers of the world to identify the frontiers of knowledge for the 20th century. Well, we are going to do that again this June; and we hope many of you can be there. We are going to assemble some of the great minds of the world to discuss this; and we are also going to bring young, bright high school kids from all over the country to cross-examine them so that the people who will have to create the 21st century will have a chance to ask questions about the predictions of the great minds. That is the kick-off.

We will also hold another big conference on the spread of the rule of law and representative government throughout the world, have speakers from all over the world, with law librarians, cosponsored with the New York University Law School. So there will be some big conferences like that and smaller conferences that serve the Library particularly.

The basic thing that we are doing is celebrating what we call Gifts to the Nation, to celebrate not just the Library of Congress but the whole American tradition of knowledge-based democracy, of open access to information and knowledge, of creativity, as the escalator on which everybody ascends.

Now, the big Gift to the Nation, of course, we hope is the 5 million items of American history and culture that we have digitized as the National Digital Library, the American memory package that is usable in every locality throughout the country. We already have a million and a half on-line and another three million in the pipeline. We are on track with that.

Every congressional district has received a big package, both your district office and here in Washington, inviting each congressional district to identify something that ought to be in the national collection, that is characteristic of your district that hasn't been sufficiently appreciated as representative of your district.

We will have a snapshot view of important things about all regions of America that people ought to remember at this turn of the century, turn of the new millennium.

We will have a lot of other activities. We are going to have a retrospective on the whole history of American music. The first book ever published in America was a musical book, the Bay Psalm Book. We have by far the greatest collection of American music of all kinds, which has transformed the soundscape of the 20th century. We are going to celebrate American creativity.

We are going to reassemble Thomas Jefferson's full library, which was the basis of the Library in the 19th century. We need only 900 volumes. We have most of the 6,500 volumes and we are going to have a mega exhibit about Jefferson to celebrate the richness of his library, his papers and so forth.

This is going to be a celebration. We are also working with the American Library Association very closely. A lot of these local district treasures will be deposited in local libraries, but the library will digitize them and add them to the American memory.

Mr. Wamp. As excited as you are, you are going to turn it over to someone else?

Dr. Billington. But, I will turn it over to Jo Ann Jenkins. She has really been leading a tremendous team working in the Library. We are working closely with the American Library Association. I think it is going to be a celebration that doesn't just look back at the past, but looks ahead to the future and what we are going to be able to do with this treasure chest.

Bicentennial Coin and Stamp

Ms. Jenkins. The only other thing I would mention is the coin and the stamp. We have been approved for a stamp, a bicentennial stamp, which will be released April 24th, 2000 as well as two coins. We are still working to determine whether one coin will be the first bimetallic coin or whether it will be a gold coin as well as a silver coin.

I would just also add that we are supporting our Bicentennial with private funding, with the exception of the staff that is working in-house. Most of the funds supporting these projects are coming directly from our Madison Council and other private contributions.

Mr. Wamp. How much is that, roughly? What do you think it will cost?

Ms. Jenkins. We are working on that now. The part that is unfinished is really the television programming that we are working on. We have a commitment in hand of about $4.9 million so far from private sources.

Mr. Wamp. Thank you, Jo Ann.

Indulge me one more second, if you will, Mr. Chairman.

Dan Mulhollan with CRS, tell me what you think about what Congressman Shays and Congressman Price gave to us a few minutes ago in the form of an idea. What do you think?

Public Dissemination of CRS Products

Mr. Mulhollan. Well, actually, Mr. Shays and Mr. Price were gracious enough to give us an earlier copy, but I haven't seen the final copy of the bill. I think that they have made--and I appreciate, first of all, a compliment to CRS in the proposal. Secondly, they have been very conscious of our concerns with regard to speech and debate protections, and protecting us from litigation and discovery of confidential memoranda that serve as the underpinning of our general reports that are distributed to all the Congress, but there are two components to accomplishing that. One is that Congress is the site rather than ourselves, so it is distributed by Congress, and the second component is the ability of each member to be selective.

Wholesale dissemination is a concern arising from Doe v. McMillan, the Supreme Court case. If, in fact, you are determined to have a public information function, it is imortant to continue current policy which is that any Member or committee--House Judiciary has a number of impeachment studies up on its Web page, for example--is able to select those items and place them on the Web site. I think that follows traditional policy of CRS reports being congressional documents for decades. It is the same principle.

The concern that we need to discuss with them is, in fact, more than anything else the issue that the whole package, all of the products, undifferentiated, would be there available under their proposal.

I will submit that the proposal last year, and now this year, has been submitted to House Administration. The Joint Committee on the Library established a task force to examine this, and it shows the increased complexity of the issue as you unfold it because you are dealing with decades of precedents.

Again, on the costs, I have to fall back upon the previous CBO estimate at this point.

Mr. Wamp. So that while they represented that there is no authorization necessary, the fact is with this House Administration task force, we actually do have an authorization question on the table, and things need to be resolved before we would be prepared as a subcommittee to go forward with their recommendations?

Mr. Mulhollan. I would submit that with the complexity of the issues involved, that House Administration and Senate Rules Administration are very interested in this, and there has been, for instance, a letter signed by the Chair and Ranking Member from Senate Rules Committee on this matter to the Senate, and I know House Administration has been diligently looking at the issue itself.

Mr. Taylor. Do you have any possible estimate of what the costs for their full bill would be?

Mr. Mulhollan. Well, the costs that had been identified were correct with regards to the technical side, but we also identified other implications. One, for instance, is that we anticipate, notwithstanding the good intention of the bill, additional public inquiries. We had additional costs there. It is interesting that they see that this would decrease in publication costs.

We see a possible alternative explanation that, in fact, a lot of people don't have downloading capacity; that, in fact, a number of people throughout the country would identify those reports and ask for printed copies of those. A third cost we anticipate, based on conversations with LAs and LDs, legislative directors, is that they would be more apt to ask for tailored confidential memoranda on legislative issues before they go before the Congress, and that is the significant expense. The Congressional Budget Office's estimate ranged between $2 million and $7 million from the previous bill.

It is a preliminary cost estimate. We need to underscore that because it was not reported out. But at this point I would say that subsequent considerations would be implied in the current draft, but I have to take a closer look--H.R. 654 was introduced yesterday, and I haven't seen its final version.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. I was going to ask, $100,000 to $2 million, that is a long way.

Mr. Mulhollan. I think that is because the Members were pointing to the technical side, setting up a separate Web site, and then ongoing costs of that. In fact, in their proposal, as I understand it, these would be costs borne by HIR. But there are additional costs arising from a change of behavior and the impact on our services and that is where our estimates of the additional costs come in.

Mr. Pastor. What would be the change of behavior?

Mr. Mulhollan. Change of behavior would be in the number of public inquiries, which we have estimated previously at 55,000. Another would be in printing. We estimate, on the contrary to their assessment, that there would be increased printing costs on our part because of what I previously mentioned, and that ranges between $200,000 and $400,000. But themajor cost was the additional staffing necessary to meet the increased demand for confidential reports. By that I mean, for instance, right now, when someone asks us to do a memorandum for someone, they are saying, can we turn this into a report? We say, yes, that is fine, and we would change it to make it more available not just to a member of a committee, let's say, but a whole committee or even Members for a floor vote.

We believe that there would be more reluctance for that if they thought that this would be immediately broadcast to the world, and I think this is implicit in the provision that there is a 30-day layover, recognition and concern about that, and that itself is an administrative issue that would have to be attended to.

CRS is the only organization that I am aware of that has constantly moving products, where on active legislative issues we have roughly 500 reports, and 200 issue briefs; that if you are on a high-velocity issue, it can change three times that week with the analysts attendant to that, so that you have a constant change of these documents. We are trying to meet your needs.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[A question from Mr. Hoyer and response follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Peterson. First, I am new on the committee, but I want to congratulate the Library of Congress in general for the role you are playing in this country of preserving our history and hopefully providing us with the information that we need to be good legislators.

I would like to focus in on the CRS side, if I can. I am not as excited about it being a public information system as maybe some are. This is a competitive business, and having 19 years in State government, we always had to compete against Governors and all the departments, and I don't know that all of their workings are public, but it is a debate process for the public good. I guess I am more interested in your ability to maintain the quality.

I have been impressed here, my short time in 2 years, with CRS in the kind of work they do and the institutional memory, and I think that is the key thing. I guess the ability for us to compete with the Presidents of the future, I don't care which party they are from, and the need as a legislative body to protect our ability to debate the issues and understand the issues, and institutional memory is so vital.

CRS Succession Plan

I got a little nervous when I read here on page 6, since many of the staff will be retiring soon, CRS will lose expertise in a significant number of areas including public finance, Social Security, health, constitutional law, biomedical policy, natural resource policy, macroeconomics and military personnel, and by 2006, 50 percent of current employees are eligible for retirement. Now, that is like dumping the brain out.

I mean, I not only think we need to be thinking about bringing the next team in and training them, but maybe we ought to look at incentives for people not to retire. Instead of having a small percentage leaving annually, it looks like we are going to hit a period where we are going to dump half our brains out, and I think it is a very dangerous thing for the Congress to lose that much brain power.

Maybe we ought to be looking at even more acceleration. You are talking about bringing the next team in and training them, but also we ought to be looking at incentives to keep people and try to get this balanced out somehow. You said you had a buildup in the 1970s.

History of CRS Buildup

Mr. Mulhollan. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 was a significant legislative milestone which increased our staff by more than two and a half times in the early 1970's. If you recall, it was the time of both Watergate and another Presidential impeachment issue, and Congress was finding doors closed looking for information from the executive. They found that, in fact, as a result they needed their own expertise, and Congress decided shortly thereafter not only to increase us, but they also established the Budget Office--the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to provide its own budget analysis as well. It was a time when Congress said it had lost too many of its own resources.

Those people who came to CRS stayed with CRS. We are very proud of that. One example, if you will bear with me, is that there was a panel requested by the Judiciary Committee, and 5 of the 10 people who were on that panel from CRS had been here for the 1974 impeachment inquiry. I think that our institutional memory has served Congress well.

Mr. Peterson. I think institutional memory is so vital, and even more so in the future. How many people are really designated to research like that? I mean, what are the numbers?

Mr. Mulhollan. I think the number is roughly 294 who are eligible to retire that we have identified.

We have had terrific cooperation of our staff, and we had those people to give us the time frames when they anticipated to retire, and what we have done is to analyze the impact on those subject areas. So, for example, if we have six people in natural resources, and three of those are planning to retire by 2002, that is our highest risk.

So we have, at the same time, revived the graduate recruit program where--we have 20 this year--we are trying to get the best and brightest with a real emphasis in getting greatest diversity in our work force as well. And for the 20 positions we had over 500 applications from the graduate schools across the country, a great range, and we are hoping to bring the best and the brightest the country can offer from those who want to sustain democracy and work to help to maintain the democratic process. There are a number of students interested in public service, and that is what we are trying to do here.

Mr. Peterson. Has there any thought been given to some enticements, inducements, in areas that are considered critical so that people wouldn't retire as quickly?

Mr. Mulhollan. We haven't considered that one issue. More than anything else what we have done on a very selected handful of cases is provided contracts to people who have retired to help do some mentoring. For example, our person in Federalism stayed on and did a whole series of products and basically laid out in written form her institutional memory. That is one example. We are looking, in very selective areas, to having some others do this, as well.

Mr. Peterson. I think we would be wise to have a bonus system that would be available; not just for anybody, but I mean when it is needed.

Mr. Mulhollan. We would be happy to explore it.

Mr. Peterson. I don't know how the other Members feel, but it seems to me that you are going to be losing an inordinate number of people in a short period of time; at a time when information is exploding. What we need to know as legislators today is so much more than 10 years ago. It is going to be even more in 5 years or 10 years. It is almost scary.

Dr. Billington. I would stress not just for the CRS analysts, but particularly for the Law Library, which is responsible for the U.S. Government for foreign law codes, which are changing all the time. Now we are getting foreign law codes electronically in realtime, and it is a problem for our foreign language collections.

Increased globalization of the economy affects every part of what we do internally in this country, and we have unique resources there. We need to replace analysts up and down the line, because this is a librarywide problem. It is also a librarywide opportunity.

I do want to thank the Committee for giving us the beginnings of a succession plan with CRS last year, which has helped a lot, and that is an important request that we have in this year, and it really is quite minimal for the nature of the need that we have. It is the best way to go because these are not cookie-cutter jobs. These are unique researchers, using unique resources for a unique deliberative body in the world, and therefore really the only way they can ever learn it is on the job given some basic skills.

We appreciate your concern for this, and we want to work with you to make sure that we continue to be able to provide you what you need.

Mr. Peterson. I think we must make sure we don't shortchange our brain trust.

Dr. Billington. Absolutely.

General Scott. Mr. Chairman, if I might just address an answer I gave to Congressman Wamp just a moment ago.

Mr. Taylor. Yes.

Growing Workload Increase in Budget

General Scott. When I told you, when you said there would be no increase to the budget, we do have a $3.4 million net growing workload increase, and that is mainly for automation.

Mr. Wamp. $3.4 million?

General Scott. Yes, a $3.4 million net increase. But the rest is as you said it was, 83 percent of that budget is for wage and price-level increases.

Mr. Wamp. That was a 1 percent increase, exclusive of salary increases?

General Scott. Yes, sir.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

There is a $1.4 million item for improved collections security. Can you explain that program for us, Doctor or General? And what the overall costs would be and how many budget years would be affected?

Dr. Billington. For collection security, I think we already covered that, didn't we?

General Scott. I would be happy to go back over it. We are talking reader registration. That was the reader registration that we want to expand to Madison Building reading rooms.

Mr. Taylor. Okay.

General Scott. That was also making sure that we can have additional tagging and bar coding.

National Audio Visual Conservation Center

Mr. Taylor. Okay. There is $300,000 for the National Audio Visual Conservation Center. Have you occupied that facility yet, and what are your future plans for the facility?

General Scott. Yes, sir. With your permission, I would like to call up Mr. Winston Tabb, who is our expert on that important acquisition.

Mr. Tabb. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Culpepper National Audio Visual Conservation Center was authorized by Congress at the end of 1997. Last summer we moved the first several thousand reels of film there to temporary storage. Right now we are working with the Architect of the Capitol to select firms which will do construction management, as well as the architectural design work. We hope to have those contracts let by the end of March and have construction begin next January. That is where we are with that.

The total cost of the project we estimate to be something around $66 million, including the purchase price as well as all the design and construction work still to be done.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follow:]

Culpeper

Question. Finally, there is $290,000 for the National Audo-visual Conservation Center. Have you occupied the building yet? What are your future plans for the Center? Have you estimated the total cost to renovate that building yet? (Put an estimate in the record).

Response. The facility in Culpeper, Virginia will become the National Audio Visual Conservation Center to house and preserve all of the Library's audio/visual collections. Several thousand reels of film were moved into storage at Culpeper in August 1998. The Architect of the Capitol and the Library are working together in the selection process for construction management and architectural firms to work on the Culpeper project. The total cost of the approved Master Plan option--approved by the Oversight Committees last December--is about $66 million--including the purchase of the Culpeper facility and associated costs.

Mr. Taylor. Okay. Thank you.

The Global Legal Information Network is about $1.1 million. Could you tell us a little bit about that and why it is needed?

Global Legal Information Network

General Scott. Yes, sir. Dr. Billington just referred to the importance of making sure that we have the laws from other countries, and we need to have $396,000 that will help us to complete the development of the Global Legal Information Network. The increase would help us to continue the development of GLIN and bring additional countries on-line through training and other administrative needs that would have to be there.

We also have included in this request for the funds to ensure that we can keep the law library reading room open during regular hours. We have had to reduce the regular hours of the law library reading room because we have a stuffing shortage. So, we need another four to five people to keep the reading room operating.

Dr. Billington. I might mention also in addition to the electronic resources, the Law Library request is for looseleaf services to be kept up to date. Because of tremendous demands, we are on this continuous effort to reduce our arrearages, which we have reduced by nearly 52 percent since we started. It has been a major heroic effort, but a major area of accumulation in this year has been in these looseleaf services. It is obviously just a basic duty in serving the Congress and the government more broadly as the place of reference for all questions, on international law, being the largest international law library in the world. We must keep that up to date. That is just simply human work that has to be done, and we are understaffed to do it.

Mr. Taylor. I know, Dr. Billington, from the time I have been on the Appropriations Committee, you have worked hard to digitize much of the collection of the Library of Congress. One of the things that I have been most encouraged about is your administration's effort to spread that knowledge throughout the U.S. Because as long as it is just in the Library of Congress, the whole citizenry doesn't get the end result of the wonderful work you all are doing.

Specifically in the areas that are for teachers and students, what are you doing to emanate that information out, and do you have a plan that you put together that you could submit to this Congress to help you in that area?

Digital Access Plans

Dr. Billington. That really is crucial to the future. We have opened up a whole new vista with this American Memory National Digital Library. We want to sustain it because it has been proven to be of enormous value particularly for educational use K through 12.

We want to expand this. We have brought in 21 other institutions. We have raised private money to help, 21 other institutions also add their resources from all over the country--small institutions, big institutions, and we will add another 10 probably in the next year which will be the third annual competition. We want to continue our cooperative efforts to enrich these resources. We want to find other ways to make our collections usable at the local level.

Now, key to that is a series of teachers' institutes we have conducted. We have established a network of teachers who have some experience with this, but we really need to work more with school systems at the local level and with institutions that train teachers. We need to develop a workable model.

The great thing about this material is that it tells the story of America through an interactive technique to stimulate creativity in people everywhere, in the most remote rural area, or in places that don't have access to the great repositories of our country. It also presents materials in a user-friendly way with a lot of on-line teaching material from our teachers' institutes.

But, we really need to work with districts, to get a whole panoply of people involved. We have got something that goes direct to the kids. We have a usable library here that is great for scholars, but in between is the whole world of teachers and teacher training and local school districts with which we don't have a natural communication.

We need to develop some models to make sure that there is a human resource at the other end which we can work with in the districts and communities.

So, I think that is a very important frontier, and we hope to develop some models that will be useful all over the country after being tested in depth in some local communities.

Mr. Taylor. I appreciate that. I hope we can develop that as the session moves on. I think the next century is a knowledge century, and I think the Library is going to play such an important part in it, if we can find efficient ways to disseminate this knowledge to our young people who will be utilizing it, because it is wealth, and how we create and expand that wealth is the important function, I think, of government.

Dr. Billington. We think, Mr. Chairman, that it is also very important for our bicentennial celebration, because the basic principle, the original Jeffersonian idea behind the creation of the Library of Congress and our open access to knowledge, is that more people should get more access to more knowledge and information so that they can use it in more ways in our country; that we are going to add without subtracting; that we are going to open up more and more possibilities.

We are very excited about this digital material, but the digital material is ultimately no better than the teachers and the people at the other end of the connection who can help, because it is an electronic hook to attract an audiovisual generation back into reading and thinking and getting theminto our system. So we are very excited about this.

We would look forward to working with you and other Members of Congress on this very much.

Copyright Issues

Mr. Pastor. One more question. Can you explain the need for the $1.1 million increase for the copyright legislation support?

Dr. Billington. I think we ought to get the Register of Copyrights. It has been a very, very busy year for copyright, Mr. Chairman. Our Register has been conducting all kinds of studies for the Congress right now for other committees.

Ms. Peters. Thank you. We have a request that is based on three various components. One is related to what you have heard from the Library, which is we have to become more able to work with the digital materials, and we are doing that; our effort is named CORDS, the Electronic Copyright Registration, Recordation and Deposit System with respect to our $1.1 million workload increase, we have requested one additional person who would be working as an automation specialist. We also requested authority to spend money for digital storage space, i.e., electronic bookshelves. So there is $70,000 to build that storage.

The second part has to do with totally reengineering our processes, and we need a reengineering study that is estimated to cost $400,000. We need a person to head our reengineering efforts (a GS-15). It will be an appointment for a three year term. There are some automation costs that are also involved.

The third part concerns our huge backlog of applicants' claims waiting to be registered. It is 125,000. It should be 30,000. We have only 80 percent of the level of staff that we had in 1993. So we have included eight additional GS-7 examiners in our request.

Finally, government agencies are looking to recover more of their costs. We store materials at a Federal record center; for the first time it is asking to be reimbursed. We are seeking authority to pay that bill. This will be offset by the fees that we collect, so we are seeking authority to spend money for this purpose.

Mr. Pastor. One follow-up question. In this synopsis of the CORDS review, it talks about higher copyright fee receipts. What does that mean?

Ms. Peters. Congress, in 1997, passed a law that authorized the Copyright Office to set fees. Up to that point, it was Congress that set the fees. The law provides for the recovery of reasonable costs. However, the fees must be fair, must be equitable, and must take into consideration the objectives of the copyright system, which are, in part, to obtain the books, motion pictures and sound recordings, etc., for the Library of Congress' collections.

We have just completed a long period of study, held public hearings, solicited public comment and met with everybody. We delivered to Congress our proposed fee schedule on February 1st, with the hope that it would approve it. However Congress has 120 days to disapprove it.

Mr. Pastor. When you say Congress, is that six committees or one committee?

Ms. Peters. Basically Congress as a whole. Our oversight committee is the Judiciary Committee. We delivered our report to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate and then to all members of our oversight committee. The way the law is worded is: if there is no law disapproving the fees within 120 days, then they can take effect.

So we anticipate, as a result of this fee increase, an additional $4.8 million. The amount that we are asking for to improve our system, however, is about $2 million. So half of the increase would go back to Treasury, and half would help us do the work that Congress is expecting us to do.

Mr. Pastor. And the people who obviously need to copyright, they are not yelling and screaming that it is getting too high?

Ms. Peters. Actually, they did yell and scream. We met with every group--no one ever says, you need to increase your fees.

Mr. Pastor. Right, but they are not going to be lobbying for a law here to deny your increase?

Ms. Peters. We originally proposed a $45 basic fee. Our recommended fee is only $30, and many people are breathing a sigh of relief that it is only a 50 percent increase and not a higher increase.

You might be visited by authors, but I think we have done a very good job in balancing the equities here.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follow:]

Copyright Office

Question. Does your statutory authority allow registration receipts to be used for capital expenditures, such as buildings? You may want to research that question and provide a detailed explanation in the record.

Response. Yes, the Law allows recovery of reasonable costs for copyright services, which include the cost of storage (rental or construction of facilities). However, when the Office conducted its cost study, it did not consider cost for building a storage facility at Fort Meade, and these costs were consequently not included in the cost recovery model forwarded to the Congress.

After forwarding a proposed fee schedule to Congress, the Copyright Office determined that the cost of building Copyright storage facilities at Fort Meade were estimated at a minimum in the range of $4 million to $5 million. More accurate data will not be available until a building design study is completed with the Architect of the Capitol. If the Copyright Office were to recover from fees the cost of building a facility at Fort Meade, the basic registration fee would increase an additional $10 to a $40 level.

In conducting the Copyright cost study in fiscal 1998, which was utilized in setting fees, storage costs were classified as support provided by other federal agencies. In determining the proposed fees, it was decided to exclude support costs because of policy considerations. These considerations include setting fees that are fair, equitable and support the objectives of the copyright system. Fulfilling requirement prevented the Office from recovering even the full direct Copyright costs. Recovering these additional support costs would increase the fees to such an extend that they would drive down the demand for services. Thus, greatly diminishing the deposits transferred to the Library for its collections and exchange programs and severely undermining the registration system.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Wamp.

Mr. Wamp. No.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Peterson.

Mr. Peterson. Nothing.

Mr. Taylor. Doctor, do you have any other statements that you would like to add?

Dr. Billington. No. I would just be happy to respond to any further questions. We might want to extend some of the answers perhaps.

Mr. Taylor. Certainly. We appreciate your appearance today and look forward to working with you as the year goes on. Thank you very much for being here.

Ms. Waters is here today to make a statement. Do you have any questions of the Library?

Cook vs. The Library of Congress

Ms. Waters. Yes. Mr. Chairman, first let me just thank you for being gracious enough to allow me to come in here without notice or without any real discussion with staff.

I have been working on what I consider to be a very serious problem, and I was hopeful that prior to the Library of Congress' presentation here today the court would have made a decision, except that there has been a delay in the court proceedings and I don't know why that happened.

Let me describe it to you. I think that you, working with

Dr. Billington, can get this behind us.

I had one of the most heart-wrenching meetings I have ever had with employees of the Library of Congress, where they told me at the point of tears, and with great agony, about some of the practices at the Library of Congress. I am very disturbed about this, because the Library of Congress is such a wonderful resource for this Nation and for all of us that we should not have this blight on the history of it, and we need to get it behind us.

You are all aware of the Howard Cook versus the James Billington case, versus James Billington, Library of Congress, I suppose. It is a discrimination case, and it is ugly.

It started back in 1982, and an agreement, as I understand, was reached in 1992, and the Library of Congress admitted that it had discriminated and settled in 1994 and paid out $8.5 million and agreed to stop certain practices.

But to date the practices have not stopped, and the court asked the Library to submit a plan of action, I believe, for lack of a better description, and to comply and they are simply out of compliance. And I am embarrassed that we have got to go back before the court to talk about this compliance and will be back in court in a matter of days; would have been in court on February 5th if this delay had not taken place.

I don't want to take up the Library's time or your time or my time in trying to say, why can't we comply with the court. I do intend to go to court on this case, which is going to create a lot more tension, a lot more public attention to it, but I thought since I discovered they were here today, that you could help, Mr. Chairman. You could help by helping to get some language along with the appropriation that would say, just comply.

We have worked on some language that may or may not be all that is needed, but I wish that you would give some thought to this and see if Dr. Billington could agree that language would be helpful and that it would go a long way toward the settlement of this; that we could get this done, because I want to get out of it, but I don't want to have to pass by employees who are telling me time and time again about the problems and do nothing about it. I would be an irresponsible leader if I did that.

So I come today to make the case and ask for your assistance and your help.

Mr. Taylor. Well, certainly, as a Member of Congress and someone that I respect and we have worked together in other areas, I would always honor your request. I am always loath to get involved with court cases because they have not appointed me to the Supreme Court or even the Superior Court here in D.C., although I was angling for a job my last 2 years in D.C. But we certainly would work with you and the Library any way we can.

Dr. Billington, do you have any statement?

Dr. Billington. Well, I think we will supply a complete answer for the record. I believe we are in compliance. I don't think we have had communication from you about these concerns before now, but we are anxious to supply you with a complete answer, as well as a complete answer for the record.

[The information follows:]

[Clerk's note.--The Library of Congress supplied the following information for the record.]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Dr. Billington. We have produced a very substantial study indicating the progress that has been made in these areas of concern. I might defer to General Scott for any further comment.

General Scott. Yes, sir. I will just say that in the interest of time that we will respond completely. I would also say that the two issues that the court is currently looking at have to do with the way the Library validates its positions and also how the Library uses statistical formulas to determine whether there is discrimination or not. Those are the two issues that both parties requested an extension about because we were not able to make sufficient progress to come to the judge. But those are the two issues.

The other issues that Congresswoman Waters addresses, we would be happy to give you a complete report on.

Mr. Taylor. We don't want to get into trying this case in this committee, but we would be glad to work with you. Thank you, Ms. Waters.

Ms. Waters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Certainly we would not want you to serve as the court in this matter. Having the power of the appropriations status that you have oftentimes goes a long ways toward helping to urge people to solve problems, and that is all that was intended here today.

Again, I would like to reiterate that without this kind of gentle nudging and assistance by Members of Congress, what we have is Members of Congress who get involved at another level that creates a lot of public attention at a time when the Members of this Congress are not wanting to have fingers pointed about racism and discrimination. So I would urge you to help solve this case so that we don't have to get further involved in it.

Dr. Billington. Well, we certainly are actively involved in these two issues that General Scott had mentioned, and we will respond in full, and we will be anxious to know the individual cases that concern you. We can talk about them.

Ms. Waters. I will be at the court case. I will be at the court hearing at the time that you present the plan that is long awaited and hope that somehow a resolution will be done there. If not, I will have to continue to work on it. Thank you very much.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you very much.

Ms. Waters. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do appreciate it.

Mr. Taylor. You are welcome.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Reprogramming Documents

Question. For the record, inset all reprogramming documents, and any other Committee approval actions.

Answer. These items are attached.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. We appreciate the job that you have, and with all the requests and all the three unions you work with and the multitude of employee problems and still do an outstanding job with the Library, and thank you very much for being here.

For the record, we will insert all the program documents and any other committee-approved actions.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

[A question from Chairman Taylor and response follow:]

Blind and Physically Handicapped Program

Question. Please describe the efforts of the Library of Congress in providing reading material for blind and physically handicapped individuals.

Response. In accordance with the authority provided in 2 U.S.C. 135(a), 135(b) and 135(c), the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS), Library of Congress, administers the national program to provide free reading materials for blind and physically handicapped adults, children, and U.S. citizens living abroad. These materials consist of books, magazines, music scores and texts produced in braille, in audio, and other suitable formats.

Under a special provision of the U.S. copyright law and with the permission of authors and publishers of works not covered by this provision, NLS selects books on the basis of their appeal to people who have wide range of interests. These include bestsellers, biographies, fiction, and nonfiction items. Each book and magazine is produced full-length in braille or on audio cassettes. In fiscal year 1998, NLS produced more than 2,000 books and more than 70 magazines on audio disc and cassette and in braille. NLS develops, produces, and lends playback equipment free. Talking-book machines play disc books and magazines recorded at 8 rpm and 16 rpm; cassette machines are designed to play NLS cassettes recorded at 15/16 ips on 4 tracks, as well as standard cassettes.

This free library program of braille and recorded materials for blind and physically handicapped is circulated to eligible borrowers through a cooperating network of 140 regional and sub-regional (local) libraries in every state of the Union and U.S. territories. Braille or recorded discs or cassette books and playback equipment are distributed to network libraries. In 1998 regional libraries circulated more than 22,500,000 braille and audio books to a readership of 769,000. Readers are informed of new books added to the collection through two bimonthly publications Braille Book Review and Talking Book Topics. Bibliographic information is shared with cooperating state and local network libraries in CD-ROM and in on-line distribution. The Union Catalog of Special Format books is accessible and searchable on the Internet.

NLS, established by an act of Congress in 1931, is now exploring the change to a digital audio format that will be necessary within seven to ten years. Studies are underway to identify technical, logistical, and financial requirements.

Question. The appropriations Bill for FY97 included a change in the Copyright Act affecting the Books for the Blind program. Please explain the impact of this change and whether additional improvements might be possible due to the increased use of electronic publishing.

Response. Prior to passage of the copyright amendment of 1996, each book selected for the National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (NLS) program required permission from the copyright holder(s) before it could be reproduced in special formats for the blind. The average length of time required to obtain permission was six months. With the exception of foreign publications and dramatic literary works, which are not covered by the amendment, this period has been reduced to virtually zero. The time required to produce a braille or recorded version of a book from start to finish has gone from sixteen to nine months. The total time it now takes to produce high priority titles, for example bestsellers, is now two months.

The National Library Service for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, Library of Congress is heading the development of a standard for the next generation of talking books under the auspices of the National Information Standards Organization. A key aspect of the system envisioned is the extensive use of electronic files to generate audio and braille books in a more efficient and less costly manner than currently. NLS has conducted preliminary conversations with the Copyright Office and the leading blindness organization to investigate methods of enhancing access to publishers' electronic files.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

Law Library Services

Question. I understand that whenever the House or Senate is in session the Law Library is open and available to Members. Please provide the following information about this service: the precise nature of the service; its estimated annual cost and the number of staff (FTEs) required to provide it; the total number of inquiries received from Members or committees of each House in the last two fiscal years; and the percentage of those inquiries received before or after the Law Library's normal business hours. Please also explain whether the Law Library is required by law or other directive to remain open whenever either House is in session.

Response. The Law Library Reading Room offers a full range of legal research support and collection services to Members of Congress, committees, and their staff: Monday through Friday--8:30 am to 9:30 pm (except Federal holidays); Saturday--8:30 am to 5:00 pm. Pursuant to statute codified at 2 U.S.C. Sec. 138, the Law Library also offers reference assistance after hours, whenever either chamber of Congress is in session, although this service is rarely utilized.

Of the 3,913 legal research transactions completed for Congress in fiscal 1997, the Law Library Reading Room staff responded to one inquiry after core service hours (0.02% of the total). In fiscal 1998, the Law Library completed 3,808 legal research transactions, none of which were received after core service hours. In the first four months of fiscal 1999, the Law Library responded to three requests from Congress after-hours (during impeachment-related deliberations). The Law Library also accommodated, in this same time period, a request of the House Judiciary Chairman to remain open additional hours in order to ensure access by the Committee (majority and minority Members/staff) to legal collections and research support during its investigation and subsequent drafting of articles of impeachment. (The figures cited for transactions completed, 3,913 and 3,808, do not include the full range of legal information services provided by and through the Law Library Reading Room, such as the weekly congressional staff briefings, congressional staff attending the Congressional Legal Instructional Program seminars, and Members and staff who use the Law Library Reading Room without customized assistance.)

Existing staff provide Reading Room coverage whenever either chamber remains in session beyond normal closing hours, and are compensated with either overtime pay or compensatory time. No additional staff is employed to provide after-hours service.

Pursuant to the statutory mandate, in fiscal 1997 the Law Library Reading Room provided 104 additional hours of telephone reference service after normal hours, resulting in personnel costs of $2,257. In fiscal year 1998, it provided an additional 136 hours of telephone reference service, resulting in personnel costs of $3,026.

Vacant Space in St. Cecilia's School

Question. What plans do you have for the vacant space in the former St. Cecelia's School on East Capitol Street, which houses your child-care center? Could the House put that space to good use?

Response. In addition to the Child Care Center space on the ground floor, the Library continues to need one of the two remaining floors (approximately 5,200 sq. ft.). Upon completion of renovation, the library would use the space for the following purposes: (1) the need for off-site training or planning sessions, currently moved to hotel meeting rooms or retreat campuses (at additional expense); (2) ad hoc special Library task forces or special initiatives (such as the Integrated Library System Program Officer), currently carved out of space for planned future assignment, thereby delaying final occupancy of our renovated John Adams and Thomas Jefferson Buildings; and (3) special requests from the Congress (Members and committees) to provide space to ad hoc or on-going offices or commissions (such as the Office of Compliance, the Medicare Commission and the Year 2000 group), currently carved out of space for planned future assignment, thereby delaying final occupancy of our renovated John Adams and Thomas Jefferson buildings.

The remaining space is available for alternative uses by the Congress.

Shelving Books by Subject Category

Question. It has been suggested that the Library plans to stop shelving certain books by subject categories, and to shelve them instead by the height of the volumes and in the order in which they arrive. Is that correct? If so, why?

Response. It is not correct that the Library plans to stop shelving books by subject categories except at the secondary storage facility at Ft. Meade, where materials will be bar-coded and stored by size in specially designed boxes.

The Library is currently experiencing a severe space shortage in its Capitol Hill collections storage areas, and formed a task group to review shelving options to ensure that we are making the most efficient, cost-effective use of our existing space, consistent with the needs of our researchers and staff. The group explored a number of ways to ensure the most cost-effective and efficient use of space, both short-term and long-term. Some of the suggestions arising from the Group's work have already been implemented.

Exploration of other shelving options has been put in abeyance pending completion of the first off-site storage module at Ft. Meade, acquisition and implementation of an Integrated Library System, and development of a facility at Culpeper, Va. for motion picture and recorded sound collections. These three major initiatives are expected to solve the Library's collections management needs for the foreseeable future.

Transit-Pass Program

Question. Why doesn't the Library participate in the Transit-Pass

Program?
    Response. The Library requested funding ($504,000) from the Congress to participate in the Transit-Pass Program as part of the fiscal year 1993 budget. The Congress did not fund the Library's request. Since that time, a new law was passed that provides agencies with a lower cost option to implement this program. As a result, the Library has been evaluating use of the ``pretax'' portion of the program enacted by the Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21) effective June 1998. While the ``pre-tax option costs the agency significantly less, there would still be a staff requirement to manage and monitor the program; similar positions in other Federal agencies are staffed at the GS-9 level.
    Due to budgetary constraints, the Library has not implemented the $65.00 per month transit benefit, which we estimate would cost more than $1.5 million a year. While the Library would welcome additional funding to implement the full program, an unfunded expenditure would require a further reduction in staff. The Library's actual full-time equivalent positions have declined by 13% since 1992, and we do not support a further reduction in staff.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

WITNESSES

DAN CRIPPEN, DIRECTOR
BARRY ANDERSON, DEPUTY DIRECTOR
POLLY E. HODGES, BUDGET AND FINANCE OFFICER

    Mr. Taylor. We will now take up the fiscal year 2000 budget request of the Congressional Budget Office.
    We have Mr. Dan Crippen, who was just appointed as the new CBO Director last Wednesday, February 3rd.
    Congratulations. We welcome you.
    We also have Mr. Barry Anderson, whom Mr. Crippen has named as his Deputy Director.
    Before we proceed, let me indicate the budget request. CBO is requesting $26.8 million for fiscal year 2000. No staffing increases are requested.
    Mr. Crippen, do you want to tell us something about yourself since you just became appointed and perhaps tell something about your background and your staff, if you would like?
    Mr. Crippen. Very well. I will introduce my deputy in a moment.
    Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As you noted, this is our fourth day on the job, so the most important thing to know about us for the purpose of this meeting is that we are the new kids on the block.
    I have been in and out of Washington for 20-odd years and worked on budgets most of that time, both in and out of government. So when I had the opportunity to work at the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) it was very much in line with my interests and experience. And because Barry was willing to come with me, the opportunity was even more attractive. Barry knows a whole lot about these things, and as he will tell you, he has been working on this for as long as I have.
    We are anxious to get under way. We are just now getting

under way and are trying to figure out--beyond where the cafeteria is--what else goes on. But our able budget officer, Polly, has brought us pretty much up to speed on the request. Obviously, we are prepared to answer--if not today, in the immediate future--any questions you have. Thank you for having us. It is good to be here.

[The information follows:]

Biographical Sketch for Dan L. Crippen

Dan L. Crippen is the fifth director of the Congressional Budget Office. Mr. Crippen, who was appointed in February 1999, has served in senior positions in the White House and the U.S. Senate and is a specialist in issues relating to the federal budget, health care, retirement, trade, and telecommunications.

From 1987 to 1989, he served as the President's adviser on all issues relating to domestic policy, including the preparation and presentation of the federal budget. In the Senate, he served as chief counsel and economic policy adviser to the Senate Majority Leader from 1981 to 1985, working on major tax and budget bills as well as other legislation.

Mr. Crippen also has substantial experience in the private sector. Before joining CBO, he was a principal with Washington Counsel, a consulting firm. He has also served as executive director of the Merrill Lynch International Advisory Council and as senior vice president of the Duberstein Group. Mr. Crippen has a Ph.D. in public finance.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Anderson. I just want to say how happy I am to return to the legislative branch. I started my career in the General Accounting Office and worked there for a number of years before becoming a budgeteer, as I have been called, and am glad to have taken that name at the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for many years. And I am very happy to be back in the legislative branch.

[The information follows:]

Biographical Sketch for Barry B. Anderson

Barry B. Anderson has had a lengthy career in the federal government. From 1988 to 1998, he was the senior career official at the Office of Management and Budget, where he directed the analysis behind and the production of the President's budget proposals. From 1980 to 1988, he held various management and analytic positions at OMB, and from 1972 to 1980, he was an economist with the General Accounting Office.

Before his appointment as Deputy Director of CBO in February 1999, he was a vice president with the Jefferson Consulting Group. Mr. Anderson has a B.S. from the University of Illinois, an M.B.A. from University of Washington at Seattle, and has done postgraduate work in econometrics at George Washington University.

Mr. Taylor. Your prepared statement has been entered into the record.

Would you have any comments you want to make in summarizing or any other statement or would you like to go on into the questions?

Mr. Crippen. Go on into the questions.

Unfunded Mandates Workload

Mr. Taylor. All right. In 1995, the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act imposed three additional duties on CBO. They included cost statements for reported legislation that impose mandates on, one, State and local governments; two, the private sector; and, three, studies of legislative proposals containing Federal mandates.

In practice, how do you differentiate between studies of proposals and cost statements on reported legislation? They seem to be the same thing as it relates to the expertise of the agency.

Mr. Crippen. Mr. Chairman, the unfunded mandates requirements, as you have said, are relatively new. We have done them for about three years now. As I understand it, we dedicate approximately 17 FTEs a year to doing the unfunded mandates assessments, at a cost of just under $2 million. We do approximately 500 of those assessments a year.

When we are asked to score a bill, we also almost always review it for unfunded mandates. So the number of mandates assessments may be different from the number of bills, obviously, because mandates estimates are an assessment of the Federal budgetary impact on either State or local governments or businesses; and the legislation pending before the House strengthens the requirements, particularly in the private-sector analysis.

So the difference in requirements for the new legislation is not substantial in that we already do an analysis of each bill to see if it meets the threshold test of $100 million or $50 million. So we don't anticipate that the new legislation will require a lot more effort, but we already put in a fair amount of effort on the mandates estimate.

Mr. Taylor. Has the Congress cut back on introducing new mandates to the private sector and State and local governments?

Mr. Crippen. We can't really tell. We don't have a good way of knowing for sure, but our sense is that there is certainly more attention being paid to the issue. I am told we do a lot of consulting with members and staff before they introduce legislation, or even after they do, about what the impacts might or might not be and how we would view them. So the Congress is certainly paying closer attention than we were aware of in the past, but we don't have a tracking system that would tell you whether there were more or fewer mandates. We look at bills as they come out of committee and as we are requested to do so. But our sense certainly is that a lot more attention is being paid to the issue.

Mr. Taylor. Could you provide for the record a list of all unfunded mandate studies or statements in fiscal year 1998?

Mr. Crippen. Yes, sir. I think we brought those with us.

Mr. Taylor. Okay. We would like to have that for the record.

[The information follows:]

Unfunded Mandates Workload

Question. For the record, provide a list of all the unfunded mandate studies or statements done in fiscal year 1998, and this year to date.

Answer. In all, the Congressional Budget Office reviewed more than

500 bills and other legislative proposals in calendar year 1998 to determine whether they contained federal mandates. Most of those reviews occur when bills are ordered reported from authorizing committees. (Cost estimates are prepared and reported by legislative session.) About 12 percent (64 bills) had intergovernmental mandates, approximately 1 percent (six bills) had mandates whose costs exceeded the threshold of $50 million a year, and another 1 percent (seven bills) had costs that could not be determined. CBO also identified private-sector mandates in about 14 percent (75 bills) of the bills and amendments it examined; more than 3 percent (18 bills) had costs over the $100 million threshold for such mandates, and nearly 2 percent (nine bills) had costs that could not be determined. Those percentages are similar to CBO's experience in the previous two years. The attached table summarizes the number of bills and legislative proposals reviewed each year for mandates. Tables listing the bills in 1998 containing intergovernmental and private-sector mandates are also attached.

To date in calendar year 1999, CBO has reviewed 13 bills and legislative proposals to determine whether they contain mandates. None of those bills or proposals contained an intergovernmental mandate. Only one, S. 262, the Miscellaneous Trade and Technical Corrections Act of 1999, contained a private-sector mandate. That private-sector mandate, however, would not impose costs exceeding the $100 million threshold.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Accuracy of CBO Estimates

Mr. Taylor. Last year CBO did an analysis of estimating accuracy over the past several years. Can you summarize your findings?

Mr. Crippen. Barry and I are still looking at some of those analyses. Clearly, in the past couple of years, the estimates have been a little farther off the mark than in the past. But I would say that based on my look at the accuracy of CBO's estimates from the outside and on what little we have looked at it so far in the past four days, the estimates were not off appreciably more than those of others, including OMB, where Barry has been, and some of the outside estimators. But, clearly, we need to know where we are wrong and why, and that is one of the first things we have started looking at since we arrived at CBO.

Now, there has already been some work done. I don't want to leave the impression that nobody is paying attention to what they have. I am not comfortable enough, though, to be able to tell you today whether we know or think we know exactly why we were off. Clearly, we were off on revenue forecasts the past two or three years by underforecasting, and where we are normally off by 1 percent or 2 percent, we were off by 4 percent and 5 percent. One of the first things Barry and I are looking at is why we think we were off and what we can do to improve those estimates.

It is my view, Mr. Chairman, that our business largely is to provide the Congress with estimates. Our first priority is therefore to make sure we can provide you with the best estimates possible and, whenever the estimates are not right, to find out why and see what we can do to improve those techniques. It is a very important matter for us.

Mr. Taylor. Do you have any suggestions how you can improve it or are you still studying it?

Mr. Crippen. I am still thinking about it and studying it. Barry knows a lot more about estimating than I do.

Mr. Anderson. In the analysis that I have done, not only since I have been at CBO but also over the many years I was at OMB, the first thing one learns is humility. By that I mean that estimates of the amount of Federal Government transactions are not easy to make. Nor are estimates of the amount of the growth in the economy easy. That is why there are so many firms that try to do it and charge relatively large amounts of money to do it but still come out wrong. In fact, as Dan mentioned, one of our first acts at CBO is to go back and compare ourselves not just with OMB or other government sources but also with the private sector.

No, I don't have any easy way to do it. We have been talking to the staff, getting to know them well. They are looking at a variety of factors that we would look at. Most important, we want to talk to our group of economic advisers. We have not yet met with them, but we have about 20 or so advisers and want to explore their views about why we missed or they missed in the past.

Mr. Crippen. This is a joint effort as well. We are required by statute to take revenue estimates that come from the Joint Committee on Taxation. So there is a combined effort here between our folks and their folks as to how we view legislation and the baseline. After we have done our analysis, we need to interact, cooperate, and work with the Joint Committee on Taxation to see if we can together do a better job.

Mr. Taylor. Your studies are too large to enter into the record, but could you provide us with a summary perhaps of your studies that we could put into our record?

Mr. Crippen. Absolutely.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

CBO's Appropriation Request for Fiscal Year 2000

Mr. Taylor. Your budget is up by 4.5 percent, an increase of $1,150,000. The nation's budget is almost $1.8 trillion. It is almost not worth mentioning.

Mr. Crippen. We are not used to saying million anymore.

Mr. Taylor. That is right. Us tight folks, we still stumble over it.

What percentage is salary related? I understand a large portion of it deals with salary.

Mr. Crippen. Almost all of the increase--in fact, I think all of the increase--is for personnel. The 4.5 percent reflects virtually all of that: 4.4 percent is the increase suggested in the President's budget for personnel and for salaries. So it is almost all personnel, and much of it stems from the projected salary increase in the President's budget.

Mr. Taylor. Is the Federal budget recommending that for all Federal employees in that area?

Mr. Crippen. What they are suggesting is 4.4 percent.
Mr. Taylor. All across the board?
Mr. Crippen. Across the board, right.
Mr. Taylor. Okay. I will have some other questions. I will yield to Mr. Pastor.
Mr. Pastor. I just have a few questions, dealing with personnel. What is your authorized personnel allocation in terms of FTEs, full-time employees?
Mr. Crippen. 232.
Mr. Pastor. You have been around 220, I guess?
Mr. Crippen. As high as 227 but averaging a little over 220.
Mr. Pastor. You don't ask for new positions in this budget?
Mr. Crippen. No.
Mr. Pastor. Almost every agency has had a workload increase. I am sure you are probably in the same situation. How are you able to maintain the increased demand on you and at the same time maintain quality of work?
Mr. Crippen. I think we both have a sense here. I will share this answer with Barry.
From our four days of experience, there certainly is a need for some additional help, but we are having difficulty at the moment not only finding qualified employees but also retaining current staff. We obviously have some slots that are unfilled at the moment.
We intend to be as aggressive as we can, to go out and recruit. But finding, for example, Ph.D.s in economics, which we use a lot of on one side of the agency, is difficult. We aren't very competitive even in the Washington market with the International Monetary Fund, World Bank, and others, which are essentially unrestricted in many of the salaries they can offer. We have a hard time competing, so we have to compete on the quality of life and the excitement of going to work, and there is a limited pool of people who are willing to do that.
So part of our dilemma is finding and attracting people, into coming to CBO. It is not that we couldn't use some more help. We could. So that is our dilemma.
Part of our request includes an attempt at a modest program that would allow us to pay some signing bonuses--a small amount--to see if that might help, because, as you know, newly minted Ph.D.s, as I was once, come out of graduate school with no money, furniture to move and bills to pay, and sometimes signing bonuses help get people into their first job.
Mr. Anderson. The only thing I would add is that although we obviously weren't at CBO when the unfunded mandates legislation was passed, I believe that the law did add to the workload of CBO. There was a commonality in some of the work that CBO was doing before that and the unfunded mandates. And, in one sense, there was an effort to be efficient--that is, taking the people who were already reviewing legislation and asking them to now look for something different. There was some learning curve in that, I am sure, but nonetheless that effort was part of the reason that CBO was able to absorb half of the requested increase in staff.
Mr. Pastor. I saw in the budget we were estimating a $100,000 savings by using a different provider rather than mainframe? Do you just want to explain that a little bit?

Mr. Crippen. The House Information Resources, which we have been using for most of the mainframe applications, is now trying to remove users other than the House of Representatives. We are one of the superfluous or additional users that initially they wanted to be on their system, but now they would rather not service others. We have reached an accommodation with the Library of Congress to take some of those services for now.

We still run four mission-critical systems, which relate to our budget baseline estimates, on the House computer, and eventually we assume we will move those systems as well. But the savings you are citing come strictly from changing contract terms between the House Information Resources and the Library of Congress.

Mr. Pastor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Hoyer.

Dynamic Scoring

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you.

Dr. Crippen, was there any discussion on the whole issue of dynamic scoring that has been so current with reference to your taking this position and your views on the subject?

Mr. Crippen. In the interview process?

Mr. Hoyer. Yes.

Mr. Crippen. There was one conversation in the whole process that I had with the current Speaker, Mr. Hastert. He asked, essentially, ``What does CBO now do in dynamic scoring?'' And we do a lot of things, as you may well know. It depends on what you mean by dynamic scoring, of course, but in the main it means to me to anticipate behavioral changes resulting from changes to a Federal program.

When it comes to revenues, of course, the Joint Committee on Taxation produces the revenue estimates for legislation; and so if you were referring to dynamic scoring of revenue legislation, we do not do that, in any event. But we do a lot of dynamic scoring, and CBO has done dynamic scoring of budget resolutions in the aggregate. There have been times that the Congress has asked CBO to take the budget resolution and, because of a change in policy, provide a new estimate of both the economic and budgetary effects resulting from that change.

That, by the way, is exactly what the Office of Management and Budget does every year. The President's budget assumes that all of the policies that he or she is proposing are enacted, and all of the projections are based on enactment of that policy. So they are the most dynamic, if you will, of anyestimating procedures.

Mr. Hoyer. What was the controversy then that existed between Dr. O'Neill and the House Budget Committee, for instance, on the issue of dynamic scoring, or are you aware of it?

Mr. Crippen. I know there was a controversy. I can't tell you precisely what the difference was. I am not sure. Some of it had to do, as I recall, with capital gains realizations and those kinds of things, which again we don't do. If you are talking about a change in current law, those estimates are basically with the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Mr. Hoyer. The concern that some of us have, Doctor, is that the projections that some would have you make would make it easier to spend more money, either in terms of tax cuts or additional expenditures, and would put us therefore at greater risk of deficits.

We have now gone into surplus in terms of the unified budget, so some of us have a concern that the CBO estimates will somehow be more liberal, if you will, and therefore lead us to make determinations that may not be justified by what would be perceived as more conservative estimates.

Do you have any thoughts on what your policy will be in the context of what you have described in terms of the joint tax committee and what you do?

Mr. Crippen. Well, in that context, at the moment at least, it is hard to see how we would change anything because we have a baseline projection in place. If you make changes to that baseline for tax purposes, you don't get to see what those revenues increases are going to be anyway.

But, more important, getting to the heart of your question, lots of other people, of course, do the same thing we do; it is not just the Office of Management and Budget. A number of people on Wall Street are very good at this, and a number of former staffers around town do their own projections. So we can't get too far afield from anybody else in the world without your seeing it. So we are constrained. Even if I wanted to be crazy, we are effectively constrained by that.

Equally important, we have a pretty good professional staff and a cadre of professionals. When I say a cadre of professionals, I mean a group of analysts that is pretty well in place. That is not to say that things don't change, but we have a pretty good bunch of people who are pretty good at making sure we don't stray too far. I think there are some natural checks and balances in place, and you will see whether anything is changing.

Problems with Recruiting and Retaining Personnel

Mr. Hoyer. Doctor, back to the question that was being asked by both the Chairman and the Ranking Member on the bonuses that you are suggesting. I would be very interested in specific examples of either the inability to retain or the inability to recruit based upon constraints. If you can't do this now, you could do it for the record.

And then perhaps you could include observations not necessarily of yourself but of the personnel officers that were involved as to whether or not these were dissimilar from other agencies that might have similar problems.

Now, as you have known, we have grown to 3.6% and we are going to go to at least a 4.4%, perhaps a 4.8% pay raise. The law requires parity between the military and civilian, which I hope to maintain. It appears the military will be 4.8%, which I think is appropriate and I would hope is consistent with the law that the civilian and military stay at parity, as has been the case over the last 5 to 10 years.

For the record, could you give me those with applications not only to your agency but to other agencies who are experiencing similar problems?

But obviously, recruiting is a problem. I don't know, for instance, what a top-flight Ph.D. analyst out of one of the good schools might demand in the private sector, but I would be interested in that comparison as to why we are having trouble recruiting because that affects how much we are paying people generally.

Mr. Crippen. Absolutely. I would be happy to.

As you suggest, Barry and I haven't had enough experience to have an instant case in hand, but we will provide you with the recent history.

Mr. Hoyer. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

CBO Salaries Compared With Those of Competing Employers

Question. You have asked for authority to pay employees bonuses as part of a plan to improve your ability to attract and retain qualified personnel. How out of line is CBO compensation in critical areas compared to the salaries the staff you desire can command elsewhere?

Answer. As illustrated by the examples provided in the next question, CBO compensation is often out of line with out competitors at all salary levels. For the new Ph.D. we tried to recruit, CBO could offer at most $70,000, while the International Monetary Fund is offering $90,000. A mid-level analyst was recently hired by the Federal Reserve with an offer that included a 24 percent increase in salary and close to $20,000 in relocation expenses. And a senior analyst recently left us to work at the Urban Institute for a 10 percent salary increase.

Question. Can you offer a recent example of CBO losing exceptional personnel, or failing to attract desired personnel, and where the personnel went instead?

Answer. Recent examples are as follows:

Recruiting

We recently ended recruitment efforts with a candidate who will complete here Ph.D. in economics at Northwestern University later this summer. She received her B.A. in economics with honors from Harvard and has twice won the teaching assistant award offered by Northwestern's economics department. She was described by her dissertation adviser as ``the best student that he has worked with in his seven years'' at Northwestern.

Our starting salary for new Ph.D.s is now $63,000 to $67,000 per year and, for an outstanding candidate, as high as $70,000 per year. This candidate is expecting an offer of $90,000 per year from the International Monetary Fund.

Retention

CBO lost one of its senior analysts in December 1998 to RAND. This outstanding staff member had a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and had been with CBO for 13 years, earning a top salary of over $100,000. RAND recruited her with a $5,000 increase, a $5,000 bonus, and the promise of a salary review in one year.

A principal analyst left CBO in mid-1998 to work for the Federal Reserve Board for a $15,000 increase in salary plus two house-hunting visits and relocation expenses (estimated at $20,000). An economist with a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania, had been with CBO for three years and was earning $62,000 per year.

A senior policy analyst with a Ph.D. and 12 years of experience (five years at CBO) has just accepted a job at the Urban Institute that provides a 10 percent salary increase.

Mr. Taylor. On the question about bonuses, how much money do you intend to spend on the bonuses? Do you have any idea?

Mr. Crippen. Barry may remember. Was it 145?

Mr. Anderson. $180,000.

Mr. Crippen. That is both for bonuses and potentially for paying a signing bonus as well. So it is performance bonuses as well as signing bonuses.

Mr. Taylor. And does OMB or CRS or GAO have those procedures?

Mr. Crippen. They do. In fact, we can give them to you for the record, a wrap-up of what each of the other agencies does in terms of amounts and percentage of salary and those kinds of things.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Anderson. We have been told--and, again, I can use any experience looking at it from other perspectives--that it does make a difference, that CBO is at a competitive disadvantage against agencies who employ similar kinds of people, in part because of the bonuses.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Chairman, would you yield one second?

Mr. Taylor. Certainly.

Mr. Hoyer. One of the problems that we have, and we have had, for instance, in the Treasury Postal Committee, dealing with technical personnel in terms of analysis of evidence between ATF and FBI where differentials were made specifically for the purposes of keeping or recruiting highly technical personnel, and what happened was Justice adopted it and ATF's personnel started to leave to go to FBI because of the differential.

You just referenced the problem. It is a problem when we adopt personnel policies giving the one agency the ability to give a benefit that other agencies don't have, and then what happens is you are robbing Peter to pay Paul because one agency loses their best people to another agency because they can't compete either in retention bonuses or recruiting bonuses.

So it is really a governmentwide problem, and it is to some degree tough to look at it discretely. Because when you affect the discrete agency you impact the other agencies in terms of their ability to recruit or retain, keep their personnel from an intergovernmental transfer, looking for the benefit that is not available to their agency.

Mr. Crippen. As you just suggested, too, it is the best people, of course--those to whom you would want to give a bonus--that are attracted away from you. So you put your best people at risk.

Mr. Taylor. What is your proposal on the salary levels for the director and the deputy director?

Mr. Crippen. We were told after we arrived at CBO that the Senate Budget Committee has, in a bill that Senator Domenici has introduced on budget process reform, generously offered to raise the levels of both of our positions by one step. I frankly haven't looked at that issue since we have been at CBO, but I am told that it is in the Senate bill.

I can't tell you whether that bill will move or not. You know better than I. It contains a number of controversial budget process reforms. But the higher levels are reflected, I think, in our budget submission because of that potentiality.

Mr. Taylor. Ed, do you have any other questions?

Mr. Pastor. No.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, gentlemen. I appreciate your appearance here today.

Mr. Crippen. It is good to be here.

Mr. Taylor. Congratulations on your first hearing.

Mr. Crippen. Thank you.

[Questions from Chairman Taylor and responses follow:]

Fiscal Year 2000 Across-the-Board Pay Increase

Question. The specific increase for the federal COLA is $713,000. Please explain how that figure was calculated.

Answer. CBO is requesting a 4.4 percent across-the-board pay increase that is consistent with the pay assumptions underlying the President's budget for fiscal year 2000. The $713,000 requested for the January 2000 across-the-board increase represents the outlays for pay and benefits that will occur in that year. The amount is calculated by multiplying 4.4 percent times the CBO payroll as of January 1, 2000; increasing the result by a marginal benefit cost of 23 percent; and then reducing the total annual cost by 25 percent to arrive at the spendout for fiscal year 2000.

Ceiling on Full-time Equivalent Positions

Question. You are showing a base employment level of 232 FTEs. How many are on board today?

Answer. As of February 10, 1999, we have 211 employees on board.

Increase In Pay of CBO's Director And Deputy Director

Question. What are the Director and Deputy Director's current salaries and the proposed salaries? How do they compare with other executive and legislative branch salaries?

Answer. The Director's current salary is $125,900, and the proposed salary is $136,700. The Deputy Director's current salary is $118,400, and the proposed salary is $125,900. (See the attached table with comparable salaries.)

Question. Are your authorizing Committees in agreement with this proposal?

Answer. Yes, our authorizing committees are in agreement with this proposal.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Importance of CBO Support for New Scorekeeping System

Question. Both House and Senate Appropriations Committees are modernizing their scorekeeping computer systems. Do you plan to follow their lead?

Answer. Yes, we plan to modernize the interface between CBO's scorekeeping systems and those of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Question. We believe it is important for CBO scorekeeping systems to be completely compatible with ours so that we can continue to share data. We will be happy to assist with a reprogramming if that becomes necessary.

Answer. CBO is aware of your concern that our systems remain compatible. We have been formally asked by the Chairmen of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to join this modernization effort, and we are working hard to comply with that request in a timely fashion. However, since funding for this effort is not included in our budget for fiscal year 1999, we will ask the Committee for the authority to reprogram the necessary funds.

Fiscal Year 1998 Reprogramming Requests

Question. For the record, please supply all reprogramming requested last year, and their disposition.

Answer. In fiscal year 1998, CBO received approval to reprogram funds for two projects that were expected to cost a total of $328,000. The first project involved the replacement of several systems in the CBO library with an integrated library software system that was Year 2000 complaint. The cost of the new library system was originally estimated to be $180,000, but the actual cost was $157,000.

The second reprogramming request was for $160,000 to complete the upgrade of the network wiring in the CBO offices on the fourth floor of the Ford House Office Building. The final cost for that upgrade was $100,000.

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

TESTIMONY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND OTHER INTERESTED INDIVIDUALS AND ORGANIZATIONS

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

UNITED STATES CAPITOL VISITORS' CENTER

WITNESS

HON. JOHN MICA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Mr. Taylor. The meeting will come to order.

We will start today's hearings with testimony from Members of Congress who have contacted the committee, and Representative John Mica will make his comments first. John.

Mr. Mica. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I am here basically in support of expediting the long overdue, much studied Visitors' Center. I heard that your committee had had some testimony about a start-up date of 2003, which I think is totally unacceptable.

I come from the private sector. I was a developer. And there is no reason in heaven's name that we couldn't build this project for which the Congress has appropriated $100 million, and where we have had over $20 million in private donations. I would urge your committee to provide some leadership, some direction, in expediting this long overdue facility.

We have millions and millions of visitors. We are not in compliance with meeting even the minimum standards for these folks for common public facilities like restrooms. We have had people fainting in the heat and freezing in the cold, while the project has been studied and studied and studied. Basic plans already exist, and I would urge your consideration of trying to expedite this to possibly examine a turnkey construction project, expediting the review, and then taking the initial designs on which we have already spent millions of dollars and moving forward with the project. It is basically a shell that we are building, and we can add on the requirements, and those designs can be finished.

In addition, there are incredible savings that can be realized by starting this project now. Our utilities in this building and those that serve the Capitol complex are totally out of date. They are so costly that one private company estimated that they could build the Visitors' Center for no cost to the Federal Government or the Congress, just by the savings that could be realized by redoing the utilities to this Capitol complex.

So we are costing money by delay. I would estimate every year that we delay the cost for the project will only further increase costs, too. So I just come before you today to ask for your assistance in working with the other committees of jurisdiction, and with the leadership of the House, to urge the expediting of this, again, long overdue project.

Questions?

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Well, Mr. Mica, you expressed the feeling that the whole committee expressed last week in the hearing, that we were appalled that it was going to take this long. So we started looking at the reasons.

One of the big reasons is that so many legislative committees have a hand in it and, of course, getting everybody to agree and sign off on each item and just the time it takes to set the different meetings up is difficult. So we had an informal discussion with the Speaker's Office and the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Secretary of the Senate, and they expressed interest.

We are going to sit down and we are asking the Speaker's Office, with the Minority, making sure all ranking members and the Minority leader are involved, to see if we can't come up with perhaps a joint, one-time meeting that includes all the people that are necessary to sign off.

That is one of the ways.

Of course, I share your concern that time is going to be money, because the longer we take the more costly it is going to be.

And, of course, I agree with your other suggestion, and I hope this committee will spend some time looking at ways to save money on the project itself without destroying the quality of the project.

Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. I would agree with you, Congressman Mica. And waiting means that additional monies are going to be expended.

I agree with the Chairman that somehow we need to put our egos aside and decide the best way to do it. And I would agree with you, when I was working at the county level we had the private sector come in and construct multistory buildings and we had oversight, obviously, to make sure that everything was on time and under budget. In this case, as long as we continue to simply talk about it, we will be expending money with no construction taking place.

So I agree with you. I think we are serious about this, especially after the tragic death of our two officers.

I was coming around into the Capitol to cast a vote, and I saw a long line of people, and it was colder than heck out there. And I asked, if they were waiting to come in for the Senate trial? They said, no, these were just people trying to get into the Capitol to visit.

Mr. Mica. It is unconscionable. And what is interesting, to go back to when I presented my bill back in 1995 or whatever, you look at the testimony, and the first bit of testimony from the security folks here was that we needed to have a buffer and not have folks coming in the way that they are coming in, the general public. So it is long overdue.

I appreciate your interest. I think we can get the Speaker's attention, and we can bring all the big egos together and solve a little problem.

Mr. Taylor. Well, I appreciate your appearance and the reminder, and I appreciate your effort to join with us as this committee pushes in that same direction.

Mr. Mica. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members. I look forward to working with you. Excuse me, gentlemen.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE

WITNESSES

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

HON DAVID E. PRICE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. Taylor. We have two other Members with us on a different subject. I would like to introduce them: Congressman Shays and Congressman Price, Mr. Shays from Connecticut and Mr. Price from North Carolina. Mr. Price will start first.

Mr. Price. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Pastor. On behalf of Representative Chris Shays and myself, I have a very brief statement. I will submit the full statement for inclusion in the record and deliver an abbreviated version.

We are here to ask your assistance in continuing the trend toward fuller and more efficient public access to the workings of Congress. We are proposing that Congress provide the public limited Internet access to Congressional Research Service Reports and Issue Briefs via Member web sites, and we ask that the subcommittee provide an appropriation of $100,000 to initiate implementation of this proposal.

In 1998, Capitol Hill offices sent out roughly a quarter of a million CRS publications. That is a lot of paper and postage and staff time. Thanks to the information superhighway, there is a much more efficient and cost-effective way to get this information out to the citizens who need it, without compromising CRS's primary mission of providing timely information to Members of Congress.

Right now, the only way Members can provide on-line access to CRS publications is by loading them onto their own web sites, and a number of Members do this. This requires a substantial dedication of staff resources, and with more and more Members seeking to expand access, we predict it will result in a major duplication of effort.

So we have proposed legislation to facilitate on-line access by requiring CRS, in conjunction with HIR, to set up a special Internet site for all publicly available research products. Members and committees would then have the option of providing links from their web site to this site. This legislation would not apply to confidential research undertaken by a Member of Congress but only to CRS Reports and Issue Briefs.

Now, this proposal is, we think, a new and improved version of one that we offered in the last Congress. We are trying to take into account some of the comments that we received on that proposal. In our current bill, we are permitting access only by way of Member web sites and, in so doing, we are going to avoid, we believe, many of the potential speech and debate and copyright problems which CRS raised in last year's discussions on public Internet access. And by requiring the development of a dedicated site we will save substantial staff resources and ultimately be saving taxpayer funds.

We have introduced a bill that lays out our proposal, but we know that authorizing legislation, in fact, is not necessary to bring the public on-line. So we are therefore coming directly to you to request funding to facilitate Internet access, and we hope that you will agree that this is a good idea.

Mr. Shays. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member, I tell people that being a Member of Congress is like attending a large university, being told you have to take every course and get a passing grade. We are constantly schooling and we are constantly learning.

The CRS reports I consider as one of the best learning tools that we have available. They are extraordinarily well written. They are consistently well written. They are concise. They are easy to read. They provide very meaningful information from people who are truly experts and who try to take their own individual perspective out of it. I have nothing but tremendous admiration for the documents that CRS provides.

We are saying issue briefs and reports, which include authorization of appropriations products; and appropriations products themselves, should be on-line. We are talking about 2,500 to 3,000, as best we can estimate. And the bottom line is they are available now in written form, in documents that we give out. But they are also available on the Internet right now because Members take these reports, store them in their own system, and then they allow people to have access, at tremendous cost and duplication, because we have this data in more than one system.

Really, what we are proposing is that someone can come to a Member web site and click into the system that would allow them to get these centrally-located documents. We really hope that CRS helps you see how easily this can be done and how important it is.

And I would say to you that it doesn't include individual requests of Members and there is a 30-day lag time. I would say one additional benefit, besides the public learning what we learn and seeing what we see, some of them will truly be experts who will see this and get back to us and maybe point out areas that CRS could be a little more heads up or even more precise about, and we can pass this information on, and CRS can do with it as they will. But I think it will, in fact, even help the ultimate product be better.

Thank you.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, Mr. Price, Mr. Shays. I appreciate your presentation.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. As you know, it is not just the funding, it is an authorizing legislative matter, and we will be glad to pass this on to Mr. Thomas. I understand that the committee, the Joint Committee on the Library, under the auspices of both committees, is studying your proposal and variations of it, and we appreciate your bringing it to our attention today.

Mr. Price. Mr. Chairman, we have introduced a bill that would authorize this activity, but the reason we are coming to you directly is not to do an end run around that process.

Mr. Taylor. I understand.

Mr. PRICE. We are convinced, and I think you will be as well when you look at this, that this requires no authorization. CRS has the authority now to do this and, with a modest appropriation, could get this underway immediately.

Mr. Shays. Obviously, with the sign-off of the authorizing committee, but it doesn't necessarily have to go through the legislative process. So, you know, that is the motive for being here.

Mr. Taylor. As a member of the Appropriations Committee for a number of years, I know that we would never want to presume to both authorize and appropriate in an Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Shays. We would never encourage you to do that, on pain of death.

Mr. Taylor. I understand that. Thank you both for being here.

Mr. Pastor. I wanted to ask a questions.

Mr. Taylor. Yes.

Mr. Pastor. I guess your argument is that this already falls under the jurisdiction of CRS, so that all it is doing is implementing the different technology.

Mr. Shays. We are making another argument. These reports are in our own systems.

Mr. Pastor. Sure.

Mr. Shays. They are being used and accessed through the Internet in a far more costly system.

Mr. Pastor. What would be the objective of this appropriation of $100,000? It is basically for them to look at what would be needed to implement it so every Member can have it on the Web site?

Mr. Price. The $100,000 is derived from CRS's own estimate of the technological requirements for implementation. It would involve a GS-14 level programmer for a 3-month period. That would be a one-time cost to set up the system, and then it would involve a GS-13 level staffer full-time. That would be an annual cost of $72,000.

Mr. Shays. That, as of 1998, and we thought there would be other miscellaneous.

Mr. Pastor. $100,000 would be to implement the system, one to get it on-line and one to maintain?

Mr. Price. Yes. Those would be the start-up costs. After that, the projections become more uncertain, but certainly initially we feel this is a reliable estimate of what it would take.

Mr. Shays. Let me make one other point. The Members who store these reports now don't necessarily provide the latest update, so some people are accessing reports that are not the latest report. So Members are spending their own staff time, sometimes, trying to update as well. So there will be a savings that you won't realize. I mean, that is significant, but it won't show up in the ledger.

Mr. Pastor. Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Shays. Mr Taylor, Mr. Pastor, thank you, and Mr. Wamp.

Mr. Price. Thank you.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WITNESS

PATRICIA WAND, UNIVERSITY LIBRARIAN, AMERICAN UNIVERSITY; REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES, MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AND SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. Taylor. We will now hear from several outside witnesses who have been asked to testify. Each witness will be limited to 5 minutes of oral testimony.

Your entire statement will be placed in the record, so if you could summarize. We will use the time clock on this since we have a number of people.

Ms. Patricia Wand, I believe.

Ms. Wand. Yes.

Mr. Taylor. How are you?

Ms. Wand. I am fine. Thank you very much.

Mr. Taylor. From the American Library Association.

Ms. Wand. The American Library Association, among several others.

I am pleased to be before this committee again this year. I was here last year, and I notice that there is just one returning member, Mr. Hoyer, who, as we know, is a friend of the Library. We have worked with him in the metropolitan area on Library issues for a long time, and we appreciate his support.

I am Patricia Wand from American University Library. I am University Librarian there, and I am here today to represent five library associations: The American Library Association, the Association of Research Libraries, the American Association of Law Libraries, the Medical Library Association and the Special Libraries Association.

I was pleased to be here a few minutes ago as we went through the testimony from the Library of Congress in regards to their budget. I am particularly pleased to see the level of support that the Library of Congress receives from this committee, and it is good to know that its vital work to the Nation is recognized by the funding committee that supports it as well.

As you know, my longer statement is in the record; I would just like to point out a few highlights. It is important to note the significant growth of digital resources in a relatively short time frame--in the last 4 years have we seen exponential growth. But one of the things that we are learning is that libraries are pivotal to the dissemination and development of these digital resources.

We also know that the Library of Congress' digital initiatives are extremely important to all of us, not just to Congress but to libraries across the country. Other libraries also make significant investments in these new and evolving technologies and services.

The partnerships, the investments that are being made by the Library of Congress and the investments being made by the local libraries are providing new opportunities for access to information for the Nation and around the world.

The Library's budget request of $383.7 million provides the needed support for the Library of Congress to maintain its extremely important ongoing programs as well as to enhance its access to digital materials.

Although this request represents a 5.5 percent increase in the Library's budgets, a significant share of that increase is to cover mandated costs as we discussed earlier.

I would like to focus on four program areas: the Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, technology initiatives, the Law Library, and security measures.

NATIONAL LIBRARY SERVICES FOR THE BLIND AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED

The National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped provides recorded and braille materials for more than 773,000 blind and physically handicapped persons across the United States. This is accomplished through a cooperative network of 140 regional and local libraries and two multistate centers that circulate these resources and distribute them to eligible borrowers by mail.

We support the request of $48 million in fiscal year 2000 for the National Library Services to the Blind and Physically Handicapped and the effort to explore the further use of digital technologies in order to achieve its missions.

TECHNOLOGY INITIATIVES OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

All libraries face many challenges in regard to technology, and the technology initiatives that are undertaken by the Library of Congress are extremely important to us. Two key automation projects already under way, one of them, the Integrated Library System, and the newer one, the Electronic Resources Information Project, are fundamental pieces to this effort.

LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

In the Law Library, there are two digital library initiatives, the Global Legal Information Network, known as GLIN, and the National Digital Library Project, which is entitled ``A Century of Lawmaking for a New Nation: United States Congressional Documents and Debates from 1774 to 1873.''

We urge your full support for the Law Library's budget of $8 million. This will permit the Law Library to continue to provide a high level of service and to increase remote access to unique digital and legal information.

SECURITY MEASURES AT THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

We thank Congress for its continued support of the Library's efforts to enhance the security of its collection and its staff. The supplemental appropriation of $16,900,000 will permit the Library to take much-needed measures such as recruitment of additional security personnel, the acquisitions of security equipment and the like.

But an additional nominal amount is required to both complement and complete these efforts. We support the request of $1.3 million to support reader registration, the tagging of newly acquired library materials and the additional security measures that are needed for the reading rooms.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, as the Library of Congress celebrates 200 years of service to Congress and to the people of the Nation, we take this opportunity to reaffirm our support for this important national institution. We look forward to working with the Library of Congress in celebration of its bicentennial, where libraries across the country will join once again in partnership to highlight local legacies and the role of libraries in communities and in the development of democracy in this Nation.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today. All five of the associations that I represent look forward to working with you and the Library of Congress in the future.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We appreciate your appearance this afternoon.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. If you have any questions, if you will just ask them.

Mr. Pastor. Do you want to wait?

Mr. Taylor. No. Go right ahead, please.

Mr. Pastor. I just have one question. I have had constituents from Arizona drop in, and they were asking for a service to be implemented at the local level, but I just have to question if it can be implemented on a national level. And I think they called it Newslink, where they could call a certain number, telephone number, and they would be given the news of the day.

They were sight impaired, but over the telephone they would be able to get the current news.

Ms. Wand. Was this a service from the National Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped, or is this a commercial service?

Mr. Pastor. I don't know. I am asking because I don't know.

Ms. Wand. Right. I don't know the origin of that particular service. I don't know if anyone else at the table does.

Ms. Zagorin. I am not positive, but I think the Library Services for the Blind and Physically Handicapped provides a link, but we could find out if you would like.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WITNESS

RIDLEY R. KESSLER, JR., REGIONAL DOCUMENTS LIBRARIAN, U. OF N.C. (CHAPEL HILL); REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF LAW LIBRARIES, MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, AND SPECIAL LIBRARIES ASSOCIATION

Mr. Taylor. We also have Mr. Ridley Kessler, Jr., the Regional Documents Librarian.

Mr. Kessler. Hello. How are you? I am very happy to be here with you gentlemen.

I am Ridley Kessler, the Regional Documents Librarian at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill since 1973, and I feel every one of those years.

I want to congratulate you, sir, on your new chairmanship. We are very proud of you. I know you are a graduate of Wake Forest University, and of the law school. You might be interested to know they have been a depository library for about 5 or 6 years, they are one of our newer ones.

I was up there in December with Tom Ortel, who is one of the Government Printing Office inspectors. They went through the first inspection, and you would be happy to know that they passed with flying colors. I was very impressed. That is one of the most open law libraries I have ever been in, very spectacular.

I am here today before you representing 5 national library associations to urge your support for the Government Printing Office's fiscal year 2000 budget request of $31,245,000, for the Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses appropriations.

The future of the depository library program in the electronic age is very important to the citizens of North Carolina, including your constituents in the 11th District, and to the almost 1,400 depository libraries throughout the United States. In North Carolina, our 33 depository libraries are located in every congressional district. And our students and teachers, businessmen and researchers, and certainly members of the general public have local, official and, most importantly, no-fee access to information produced by the Federal Government with their tax dollars.

I would like to focus on three key points this afternoon. First, our associations believe that the GPO's proposed budget increase of $1.98 million is very important and essential to support the Federal Depository Library Program Electronic Collection, including the future development of GPO Access.

Second, depository libraries provide very significant services and investments to maintain their tangible collections and facilitate public access to a growing array of electronic Federal Government information.

And, third, our users are often frustrated when the Government information they need is fugitive or when electronic publications suddenly disappear from agency web sites.

As librarians, we are very much committed to ensuringthat electronic government information is available to the public today and that in the future it will still be available.

Superintendent of Documents Salaries and Expenses FY 2000 Budget Increase Essential

The Government Printing Office budget increase is quite essential. We commend the significant progress the Government Printing Office has made in the transition to a more electronic Federal Depository Library Program. It has been very quick, and they have done an outstanding job.

Last year, approximately 34 percent of all titles disseminated to depository libraries were in electronic format, mostly through GPO Access. GPO Access is the award-winning digital collection of more than 70 official government databases from all three branches of our government. Each month users are downloading from 10 to 15 million documents from GPO Access.

This proposed increase of $1.98 million for fiscal year 2000 is both appropriate and necessary. It will support the maintenance and growth of GPO Access. It will enable the Government Printing Office to fulfill its strategic plans for the Federal Depository Library Program Electronic Collection, including the permanent public access of electronic government information.

FDLP Significant Services and Investments

We believe strongly that depository libraries provide important services and investments, and my formal testimony provides you with a very brief description of our regional depository library collection at the University of North Carolina, as well as some cost data.

Our depository collection dates back to the early 1800s, although we didn't become an official depository library until 1884. Our collection is housed in almost 19,000 square feet. It contains about 2 million printed documents and over 1.4 million pieces of microfiche.

We have six computers dedicated to electronic resources that provide public access to our very significant collection of CD-ROMs, as well as to the online Federal Depository Library Program Electronic Collection.

Our annual budget includes personnel and administrative costs, as well as new computers which we have to replace about every 2 years to support our CD-ROM and Internet access. We also have one really big honking machine that we use for Geographic Information Services, which is extremely expensive. We have connectivity charges. We have to buy a lot of new software to maintain access. We have to buy new cabinets each year to support and file away our microfiche and CD-ROM collections. We have cataloging and binding costs, space costs and, in addition, depository libraries purchase indexes, microfiche and supporting reference materials to enhance their collection and make it more usable to the general public.

Most depository libraries, including our regional at UNC Chapel Hill, probably spend in excess of $100,000 a year just to buy these materials to supplement their depository collection.

Fugitive Documents

Each year, in testimony before this Subcommittee, our library associations express concern with the failure of some government entities to comply with the United States Code Title 44, either through increased fiscal constraints or lack of understanding of their responsibilities under the law.

Permanent Public Access of Electronic Government Information

There is a great need for permanent public access. Each year, we express concern that agencies often remove important publications from their web sites without capturing them first for permanent public access, without any advance notice whatsoever. They just--poof--just disappear. These actions have fiscal implications because they increase the cost to the Government. They increase the cost to libraries to provide access to government information, and they make it much more difficult for the public to locate and use the electronic government information that they need for their daily business.

The Federal Depository Library Program, we believe, is the most efficient system to provide the American public with government information. Our participating libraries provide the national technological infrastructure that is necessary in this electronic age to assist all of your constituents in accessing electronic information from the Government.

The Federal Government must invest in systems and services that provide the public with government publications in all formats, and they certainly must ensure that valuable electronic government information created today will be preserved for future generations.

The Salaries and Expenses increase of $1.98 million will assist the Government Printing Office in meeting this responsibility for the Federal Depository Library Program Electronic Collection.

Mr. Chairman and members of the Subcommittee, we urge you to continue to support the depository library program by approving the full budget request of $31,245,000 for fiscal year 2000.

I thank you very much for letting me appear here today. If you have any questions, I will do my best to respond.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, Mr. Kessler. We appreciate your appearance.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Hoyer. I don't have any questions.

Mr. Pastor. Well, just one question. Maybe you might be able to provide more information at a later date, but you were saying that Title 44 would probably not be revised in the near future?

Mr. Hoyer. There was an attempt last year to significantly reform it, particularly as it dealt with the Joint Committee on Printing, dealing with a lot of things that the libraries are very concerned about in terms of so-called fugitive documents, that is, documents that are prepared but do not get into the depository library system. That attempt was not successful, however, and there is still discussion about exactly what will happen now.

But, notwithstanding that failure, we defunded the Joint Committee on Printing in this committee anyway, thereby eliminating its staff. The JCP still exists, but without a staff, just like the Joint Committee on the Library.

Mr. Pastor. In the short time I have been on this committee, one of the things that is beginning to bother me is that the public is paying for the production of documents and, because of the separation between the legislative branch and the executive branch, we may have information that the public has paid for that is being lost. It is being lost because we are not having a procedure that is uniform where we require whatever Federal agency publishes a public record that they somehow have to deposit it so that it will be stored and the public can go and retrieve it.

The public is paying for it. They should have at least access to it, and it should be stored somewhere.

Mr. Hoyer. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. Pastor. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. There is a substantial controversy as to who can print what, where. The law requires that the GPO print government documents. However, with technology's development, it has become easier and easier to print on-site. The biggest printer of documents is the Department of Defense. There has been a real battle back and forth within the Executive Branch.

Where the executive branch comes into play is there was a question as to whether the Joint Committee on Printing is constitutional in that we were performing, theoretically, executive functions; and the Executive Branch was saying we shouldn't be doing this. So where that affects what the gentlemen is talking about, where that affects the librarians, is that if it is not printed in a central place with a legal responsibility to ensure the transfer of those documents to depository institutions around the country, there have been documents which are printed which are not necessarily secret but which never get into the depository system.

Mr. Pastor. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. And we are going to have to address that. It is an authorizing issue. The House Administration Committee will have to deal with it. The Rules Committee in the Senate will deal with it, but that is what has caused the problem, because of the constitutional issue and whether or not we can continue to organize the same way, and the fact that it now has become so easy for people to print their own documents so they don't have to go through GPO.

Mr. Kessler. There are several types of fugitive documents. One very good example that I see about five or six times a month, hits the small business community. There is a series called Military Specifications and Standards. It is not classified, there is nothing dangerous about it; for example, it includes standards for how the military makes paint. The military specifications and standards were a depository item for many, many years. I still have old ones downstairs in our depository collection.

Every month I get calls from the eastern, the western, and the middle part of our State, from various small, independent producers. There's a guy that wants to make paint, he wants to try to sell it to Fort Bragg, and he is trying to go through the system, but we no longer receive this material.

I went through the Defense Information and Technical Center, which has the most excellent web site you have ever seen. It is easy to get into. They have an excellent index.

I can pull up these standards, but I can't read them or print them off because that requires a fee. You have to pay. So I have to tell these people, well, I can give you the web site but then you have to pay for the information. That is the kind of thing that drives documents librarians absolutely wild, and we see that in a lot of different applications for other electronic information resources.

Mr. Pastor. Mr. Chairman, we ought to encourage a notion that there should be a central place where documents are deposited, regardless of what Federal agency publishes them, so that the public can have access to it and use it whenever they desire since they paid for the publication.

Mr. Hoyer. Would the gentleman yield again?

Mr. Pastor. Yes.

Mr. Hoyer. We have passed, on a number of occasions, specific directions, by law, to print through GPO. It is ignored, on the theory that we don't have the authority to do that because of the constitutional issue. So I agree with the gentleman, but it is not that simple.

Mr. Pastor. Okay. I just want to make my point, Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Wand. As librarians we are delighted that you are cognizant of these issues and that you are joining with us in trying to correct the deficiencies that we are experiencing. When government information in fugitive, we are unable to deliver the government information the public needs and has a right to, that they have paid for already.

Mr. Kessler. We appreciate your interest, believe you me. I have spent 31 years of my professional life on this one issue.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Pastor has a new job here.

Mr. Pastor. I have a career for the next 30 years.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Kessler. You give me the government information, Congressman. I will get it to the people who need it. Take my word for it.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, Mr. Kessler. We appreciate your testimony--as a member of the board of visitors that put together the work on the new library. It is actually not exactly new, but it was when I worked on it.

Mr. Kessler. It still looks good.

Mr. Taylor. We appreciate your comments about it.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

LAW LIBRARY, LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WITNESSES

JANET S. ZAGORIN, CHAIR, ABA STANDING COMMITTEE ON THE LAW LIBRARY OF CONGRESS, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
SAUL SCHNIDERMAN, REPRESENTING AFSCME LOCAL 2910
DENNIS M. ROTH, REPRESENTING CREA, LOCAL 75

Mr. Taylor. We have Janet Zagorin, American Bar Association, Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress.

I would like for you to introduce your guest and make what statement you want to make in whatever order.

Ms. Zagorin. I am Janet Zagorin, and I am pleased to be representing the ABA. I am the Chairman of the Standing Committee on the Law Library of Congress, and I am joined by a member of my committee. We are very honored to have former Congressman Bill Orton from Utah, and I appreciate your letting us appear today before this committee.

This committee has supported the Law Library's request and budget in the past and has been very, very understanding of the role of the law library in United States culture.

You have my written testimony. Bill and I would just like to summarize a few really important points, although now I am almost convinced that you could probably present the testimony for me.

I have also prepared, which, if you wish, we have copies of to assist in summarizing, just a couple of charts that show some statistics about the Law Library of Congress, which is essentially your library--it is the Library of Congress. If you would like to have copies, I can provide them to you.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We would like to have them certainly as part of the record.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

William T. Orton

William T. Orton was born in Ogden, Utah, and resides in Provo, Utah. He graduated from Weber County High School in Ogden in 1966. Orton attended Weber State College. He completed a two-year mission for the Mormon Church in Oregon. He received a bachelor's degree in anthropology archaeology from Brigham Young University in 1973 and a low degree from their law school in 1979. Orton Worked for the Internal Revenue Service as a tax examiner, auditor and regional instructor. He was a private tax attorney and a counsel to the Atlanta, Ga., law firm Merritt & Tenney. He owned the Tax Training Institute, which provided education materials and training seminars on tax laws. He was elected to the U.S. House in 1990 and re-elected in 1992 and 1994. He lost in 1996. Orton is married to Jacquelyn Massey.

Profile

Bill Orton had wrestled with the idea of giving up his House seat to challenge three-term Sen. Orrin Hatch, R-Utah, in 1994. But in February of that year he announced that he'd decided against it. ``As I look at it, I see a tremendous opportunity to have an impact, an effect right where I'm at,'' Orton said. ``My entire motivation in being back here (Congress) is trying to make some changes in the way we're doing things in government.'' Orton said he clearly had a better shot at reclaiming his House seat than ousting the powerful senator. The Democrat, who represents a heavily Republican district, has bucked his party with his votes on certain key issues. In fact, he has received higher approval ratings from some GOP-backed groups than from liberal groups. He voted in favor of a measure to impose a requirement of parental notification when minors seek abortions, He voted against President Clinton's economic stimulus plan. He opposed a move to force businesses to grant unpaid family and medical leave. Orton was not among the fiercest defenders of Clinton when allegations surfaced that the president may have been involved in questionable real estate dealings in Arkansas. The lawmaker decried attempts by Republicans to turn hearings on the Whitewater matter into what he called ``a witch hunt,'' but even he expressed hope they would provide answers about questionable contacts between federal probers and the administration. Orton won his first bid for the House in 1990, filling the seat vacated by retiring Republican Rep. Howard Nielson. Orton described himself as a conservative Democrat, but acknowledged he faced a tough battle in what some called the most conservative congressional district in the county. Orton said his views on key issues put him in the political mainstream, despite his choice of parties. ``I believe essentially that abortion is murder,'' he said. ``Supreme Court opinions say the states have the right to limit the availability of funding for abortion and therefore I believe Congress should not be involved. But rape, incest and the life and health of the mother are reasonable restrictions a state can impose.'' He favors the death penalty. Orton said his experience as a tax attorney convinced him that the deficit could be reduced by shifting tax burdens and changing spending priorities. He believed the country should lower military spending during the Cold War thaw, but opposed cutting back on military personnel. Orton said the federal government should play a greater role in funding public education, but he opposed federal involvement in choosing school curriculums. In the House, Orton served on the Banking & Financial Services Committee and the Budget Committee. The liberal Americans for

Democratic Action gave Orton's 1994 voting record 25 points out of 100; the American Conservation Union gave him 79 points.

Ms. Zagorin. The Law Library of Congress, as you will see from those charts, is certainly the largest legal collection in the world. And as I said, it is the library of Congress, and it is virtually your library across the street.

While we believe that this law library presents to every Member of Congress or their staff upon demand and any member of any State or Federal legislative entity the most sophisticated, complex and timely research and information in a highly confidential manner, I think the interesting thing is that it is also the law library across the street of virtually every citizen in the United States, and it has become more so that in the last couple of years. Contrary to what many people have thought in the past about libraries, the Law Library has a much more important role in our culture today than it ever did before.

You have heard lots of testimony today about numbers and about what is in the Law Library, but it is the preeminent collection of democratic rule of law, comparative rule of law and foreign law in the world. And while it serves you, it also serves, through its unbelievable Web page and Internet access, every one of your constituents, your citizens, from students to senior citizens. So that while you may get a study on extradition laws or health care or pension reform in other countries, members of your constituency can log on and find out about proposed amendments to health care legislation, Federal regulations, congressional hearings, as well as the whole body of American law and foreign law for the last 200 years.

I think that when we look at the budget requests that they have given us, and that the Law Library has presented to you, it is extremely modern and reasonable in the context that to convert to computerization takes some commitment of resources. They are expanding all of the resources of the Law Library on-line, making accessible the collection from any remote site, as you were mentioning one of your constituents was asking. But it is not just for citizens in the United States, but also for citizens outside the United States. It is a return of investment, and I don't think that it can be expressed simply in numbers.

I think it is an opportunity, and I don't think that there is as powerful a statement about the Congress' commitment to the rule of law and to the democratic process than opening your library to the world. Basically we are showing people as a role model that we are enabling them to access any statute, any debate, any argument on the Hill and to use our legislative and our legal system as a model for their systems.

As you see from the charts I gave you, while we have at the Law Library of Congress the largest legal collection built over 200 years, we have the smallest staff and the smallest budget of any of the major research law libraries in the United States, which are private and not accessible and are not being used in a way that we want to express in the democratic process. Therefore, the American Bar Association is very grateful for your support in the past and for certainly the recognition that you have of this committee and the role of the

Law Library, but we would ask that you support their request for an increased budget this year.

I think Bill has a few comments.

Mr. Orton. Thank you, Chairman Taylor, Ed and Steny. I appreciate the courtesy to appear before you for just a minute on behalf of the American Bar Association, testifying in support of the budget request by the Law Library of Congress.

As Janet said, the charts plainly show that the Law Library of Congress has the largest collection with the smallest budget and the fewest staff resources.

We can be very proud that they are doing a great deal with such few resources, but they need more, and we would like to thank you. We appeared last year, and the year before, and the year before that asking for additional resources. We appreciate what you did last fiscal year. It was very helpful. But we still need more, or they still need more. And what they are requesting in this fiscal year budget appears to be a very large request. It is a 17 percent increase. But, if you look at the reality of what has occurred, if you gave them the entire request they have asked for, they still would not be back up to the 1994 level of staff resources before the 3 years of flat budget. So during those 3 years, where there was no increase even for inflation, they lost so many resources that if you give them the entire budget request, they won't make up what they have lost.

And just one example of the impact of that, much of thelaw resources, since they change on a daily basis, are reported through looseleaf services like CCH and so on. They send you every week, and some daily, an update service so that your legal services is accurate enough and up to date. So if you go into the Library or ask your staff to pull a statute, you have the up-to-date information with the statutes, the court cases, and so on.

The reality is they have, I think they told us, two staff members to file all of those millions of updates. They are so far behind. If you go over there right now and ask for information, you can't get up-to-date information because they simply haven't had the resources to file it yet, and that continues to back up on them.

So they desperately need resources to be able to hire at least filing clerks so they can keep it up to date so that your library, that you rely on, will be up-to-date and you know that the information is accurate.

So we strongly urge you to provide the requested resources. And as I say, it won't even get them back up to where they were previously, but we appreciate what the committee has done and hope that you will continue to support them. We thank you very much for your interest and courtesy and support.

Mr. Taylor. If the supplements are left out, then you don't have the law, and you might question why you are providing a law library that doesn't have the law.

Ms. Zagorin. Well, it is a good question, and as I said at the beginning, I assume that all of you know that whenever you are in session, when Congress is in session, that law library is open so that any member of your staff, whether it is an all-night session or not, can have access to their research and to their research staff. And throughout the course of any congressional session, they are invaluable to you and your staff in providing some of the most relevant information that you rely on. You rely on it both from a domestic and from a foreign point of view in trying to develop new statutes, and also look at the impact of the previous statutes and the form.

As Bill said, I think they have done a great deal. I think there is a great deal more to do. We must maintain the Law Library. As we enter the millennium, I think it would be really a very sad comment, at a moment when the whole world is looking towards us for our models in terms of the democratic rule of law, for us to deny the Law Library the ability to keep up and at least to maintain its unparalleled collection. A law library or any library does not remain the same--it either falls behind or moves ahead, and I really think that this is a library devoted to providing service both to Congress and to the citizens of the United States. With the increase that we are asking, we will be able to do a great deal more on-line, and they are bringing together a lot of foreign jurisdictions who are using the on-line system for the first time in the history of their cultures for access to the statutes.

So we do appreciate very much the support that you have given them in the past, and we really urge you to assist them again this year.

Mr. Hoyer. Mr. Chairman, could I just ask a question. As I understand your charts here, Harvard has 36 personnel dedicated to the law library.

Ms. Zagorin. Research.

Mr. Hoyer. Okay, 36 dedicated to research. The Library of Congress has 12. It would be an interesting comparison to know the number of transactions. In other words, I don't know whether Harvard has more transactions or not than the Library of Congress. One would think they do not. They have very close to the same number of volumes.

I went to Georgetown. I noticed Georgetown has quite a percentage less in terms of documents. You have the gross numbers here, but if you have a lot of volume but not a lot of transactions, you may not need as many personnel. On the other hand, it is hard to believe that Harvard has more demand on its resources than the Library of Congress Law Library, so that I think a relevant comparison would be how many transactions those 12 researchers handle versus the 36 researchers at Harvard.

Mr. Orton. We can certainly get that information and submit it to you.

Mr. Hoyer. The library itself, I don't know whether Harvard keeps that kind of statistics or not.

Mr. Orton. If they do, we can get it to you.

Mr. Hoyer. I am pleased to join you in welcoming former Congressman Orton here, who was clearly one of our most able Members. One of the losses that the American public sustained was that Bill Orton was never a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He was one of Congress' tax experts and made a tremendous contribution during his service.

Bill, it is good to see you back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Taylor. Certainly. We appreciate all of you coming in and making your contribution.

Ms. Zagorin. Thank you very much.

Mr. Taylor. We now have Local Union 2910, Mr. Saul

Schniderman, and also Dennis Roth of the Congressional Research Employees Association.

Mr. Schniderman, Mr. Roth, which one wants to go first? Mr. Schniderman?

Mr. Schniderman. Yes.

Mr. Taylor. All right. If you will make your timing 5 minutes, and we will put your entire statement into the record so you can summarize it if you would like. We will have questions for you.

Mr. Schniderman. Thank you, Chairman Taylor. I think it will be under 5 minutes.

Library of Congress Professionals

Chairman Taylor, Ranking Member Pastor and Members of the Subcommittee, I am Saul Schniderman, president of the Library of Congress Professional Guild, AFSCME 2910, and I am here today on behalf of the Guild--that is the name we are known by at the Library--speaking in support of the Library's budget request for fiscal year 2000. I am also here to thank the subcommittee and the staff for the support they have shown the Library of Congress and its employees over the years.

Accompanying me are Peter Inman, Chief Steward for the Guild; and Kent Dunlap, our Chief Negotiator; but quite frankly, I think they are out in the hall. Oh, no, they are here. Thank you.

We represent over 1,400 professional employees at the Library of Congress, excluding employees of the Congressional Research Service, and we are dedicated to providing the best possible service to the Congress and the American people.

AFSCME Affiliation

We are affiliated with AFSCME, which is the largest union in the Executive Branch of government. Along with our sister union at the Library of Congress, AFSCME 2477, which represents clerical and technical employees, and Local 626, our colleagues at the Architect of the Capitol, AFSCME represents over 3,500 Legislative Branch employees on Capitol Hill.

Transit Fare Subsidy

We have presented each subcommittee member with a copy of our written testimony, which outlines our concerns, so this afternoon I will bring to your attention only one, and that is the major concern for Library professionals, and that is the lack of the transit fare subsidy program at the Library of Congress.

As the Chairman, the Ranking Member and subcommittee members may know, the Washington metropolitan area is ranked second worst in the nation in overall traffic congestion, behind Los Angeles. Also our area has the dubious honor of being ranked in terms of the longest commuting time and the highest per capita congestion costs in wasted fuel. Here on Capitol Hill our traffic situation is bad and probably will get worse.

Part of the traffic problem here may be caused by the increasing influence of the Congress on the life of the Nation, which has brought a renewed interest in the history and the role of the Congress and its renowned library. Tourists from around the world come to Capitol Hill to visit our two national historic landmarks; this building, the United States Congress, and the recently renovated Jefferson Building, and these tourists often come in automobiles and buses. The tour bus situation is especially critical on the Hill because tour buses often cruise the streets unable to find a place to park.

The general increase in tourism in Washington, D.C., the upcoming Library of Congress bicentennial, which is 1999 to 2000, the proposed building of a Visitors' Center on the east plaza of the Capitol, these conditions will lead to gridlock, congestion, air pollution and possibly road rage on Capitol Hill, but I dare say that our Capitol Hill Police, God forbid finding somebody on Capitol Hill committing that act.

There are more than 140 Federal agencies who have done their share to curb traffic in the area by participating in the transit fare subsidy program. The House of Representatives participates, as do the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol.

Our deputy librarian, Mr. Scott, has shown an interest in the subsidy program, and when surveyed last year, 43 percent of LC employees indicated they would be willing to switch from private to public transportation if they had a travel subsidy.

As an employer of over 4,100 employees, the Library of Congress has a pivotal role to play in efforts to relieve traffic congestion on Capitol Hill and the region.

Mr. Chairman, when the Library's four unions brought this concern forward to upper management, the response was not ``no.'' However, the Library did not see fit to include a request for funds for transit fare subsidy in its budget proposal.

In any case, one high-ranking LC administrator told me, doing the right thing and paying for it are two different things.

This year we are going to be stepping up our efforts to educate the staff and management at the Library about the benefits of the transit fare subsidy program. And I would like to end my testimony by appealing to the subcommittee to assist us in any way that you can.

Traffic congestion and air pollution is a local and a regional problem, and the Library of Congress should join the House, the Senate and the AOC in being a model employer in this regard. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Do you want to ask any questions?

Mr. Pastor. I know that last year we had a big debate, and I think in the appropriation bills we set aside money so that the House members and their staffs could participate in such a program. The idea was that if they came on the bus or the Metro, then we would help them out, and that way congestion would be minimized.

In the area I live in, in Arizona, we are a nonattainment area as it deals with air quality. The private sector as well as the public sector has implemented programs where employees are encouraged to use the public transportation system so that we minimize the pollution and at the same time avoid the congestion.

I don't know what the costs would be, but I think it would be worthwhile, Mr. Chairman, that we ask the Library of Congress to look at it.

Mr. Taylor. We could.

Mr. Pastor. And see what they can recommend to us.

Mr. Taylor. There are two ways to encourage. We could put a penalty for those that come in automobiles. That is the other way.

Mr. Pastor. Well, I mean, there have been efforts, I think within our own House, that before parking, premiums were given to carpooling, and so that if you did not want to participate in a carpool, you were encouraged to participate by not having either free parking or by getting parking the furthest away from where you work. But there are different ways of doing it.

I think that maybe we might encourage the Library of Congress to look at what would be the cost of implementing a system where someone who uses the public transportation or something can be given some subsidy.

Mr. Taylor. Or those who do not, pay the penalty.

Mr. Pastor. Sure, you could. There are ways of doing it.

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Roth, would you like to make your statement?

Mr. Roth. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pastor, my name is Dennis Roth, president of the Congressional Research Employees Association, representing all bargaining unit employees in professional, technical and clerical positions in the Congressional Research Service.

CRS Grade Creep

Before I address the Library and the Congressional Research Service's budget request for fiscal year 2000, I would like to respond to a perception reference of grade creep in CRS. In fact, many positions in CRS are on job ladders, that is, multiple graded. Because many CRS employees have been employed by the Service for most, if not their entire, careers, and the latest data shows that the average employee at CRS is about 18.4 years, I know compared to Congress that is a lifetime, they have been able to achieve the top of their grade ladders. Thus, the high grade structure that you see and I think that concerns this subcommittee results from the high level of performance and many years of dedicated service to the Congress. Believe me, as union president, dealing with the concerns of staff, promotions are not handed out easily. They must be justifiably earned.

With respect to the fiscal year 2000 budget request, I would like to focus on the following issues: The request for a full-time ergonomist; workstation replacement in the Madison Building; a request for upgrading the Library's digital voice switch; the Congressional Research Service succession program request; and most importantly, the reorganization of the

Congressional Research Service.

Need for an Ergonomist

Furniture purchased in the 1970s is not appropriate for computers which have replaced typewriters and is increasingly leading to health, comfort and productivity problems. The Library needs a full-time ergonomist to support and work with the volunteers on the Library's Workplace Ergonomics Program Committee. Currently, some staff must literally wait months for a worksite consultation to determine their ergonomic difficulties, and the solutions may be very inexpensive, such as using telephone books to prop up your feet, changing your screen, getting a screen saver. But a lot of damage can be done in that long period it takes to get these evaluations. So an ergonomist that could work with this committee and give us some force would be very important.

Workstation Modernization

The Library is also requesting funds to modernize the workstations in the Madison Building. We wholeheartedly support this request and urge you to give it high priority. Desks designed for typewriters do not accommodate desktop computer equipment, towers, monitors, keyboards, mice, et cetera. But more than suitable desks are needed. Ergonomically compatible workstations include integrated panels, work surfaces, tables, pedestals, shelves, panel-hung lamps and so on. Ergonomically deficient workstations lead to health and safety problems, which in turn lead to increases in worker compensation claims.

The Library needs to replace furniture designed and built nearly two decades ago with adjustable PC tables, keyboard holders, wrist holders and so on. Because nearly every employee in CRS now has a computer on their desk or access to one in their work area, any delay in this initiative could result in higher costs to the Library in terms of sick leave, lower productivity and increased on-the-job claims.

We also request that you strongly encourage the Library to include members of the Workplace Ergonomics Committee Program as active participants in the selection of the ergonomist and in the selection of the new workstations. This would give the workers who actually have to sit and use the equipment some input into the decision-making process.

Voice Communications System

The Library's existing voice telecommunications system was installed at least 10 years ago and is sorely outdated and in need of replacement before we find ourselves in a crisis situation. Can you imagine trying to call CRS and being told, sorry, but the phone system is down, and we don't know when it can be brought back up?

In fact, last Friday the Audix system in the Librarycrashed, and it was down for 3 or 4 hours, and it was a total surprise. Nobody knew what was happening. So we are already seeing evidence of some of the problems. If this request is not funded, it may have severe negative consequences.

CRS Succession Initiative

Let me now focus my testimony on the Congressional Research Service. As mentioned last year, we strongly feel that the Service does not make adequate use of existing staff in trying to deal with the retirement/succession initiatives. Your committee report on the 1999 budget last year made a similar observation. Many CRS employees not in analyst positions possess advanced degrees; however, their barrier to advancement is that they are already employed in the Service doing a different kind of work.

Promoting from within not only saves money but is good for the morale of staff.

CRS Reorganization

On October 19, 1998, CRS Director Dan Mulhollan announced to staff a proposed reorganization of the Congressional Research Service. Two existing divisions, the Economics Division and the Science, Technology and Medicine Division, were eliminated, and staff were dispersed into new divisions. Under the terms of our collective bargaining agreement, CREA had the opportunity to respond to the reorganization proposal and did so on November 17th, 1998.

The issues raised in our response emerged from common themes I heard in meetings I held with each division. The response itself was prepared with input from our board of governors and stewards. I would like briefly to paraphrase from the opening of this response: We in CREA are committed to maintaining the highest possible level of service to Congress and are prepared to work closely with CRS management to ensure that paramount objective. We agree that CRS should be organized best to serve Congress. At issue is whether this particular reorganization plan, which the Director's Office devised without consulting staff or frontline managers, will actually enhance our service to Congress. Many staff are not convinced of a crisis of congressional satisfaction with CRS services. Finally, there are strong concerns about allocation of analytical resources and significant disruption of our working during the year-long process of reorganization and relocation.

Although this overall feeling still exists, we continue to meet our contractual obligations in good faith. While the substance of the reorganization is not negotiable, the impact of the reorganization on personnel practices, policies and working conditions is. We engaged in interest-based bargaining, a process I have advocated in my testimony in the past, and we have reached agreement very quickly.

CREA is pleased with the terms of the agreement. However, we remain concerned over the extraordinary burdens that will be placed on staff over the upcoming year. Despite the rejection of consultative management and facilitative leadership processes at the beginning of the reorganization process, CRS management was willing to reassert consultive management as a primary vehicle for dealing with reorganization impact issues.

The reorganization impact agreement between CRS and CREA ultimately reflects the realization that staff participation, through the use of consultive management, is the best way of affecting change in CRS. As always, we are committed to offering the best service possible to the Congress and will continue to work with CRS management to determine the organization of CRS that will accomplish this.

I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor.

Mr. Pastor. No questions.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We appreciate your statement. It will be entered into the record.

Mr. Roth. Thank you.

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

WITNESSES

HAZEL DEWS, REPRESENTING AFSCME LOCAL 626
DOLORES JONES, REPRESENTING AFSCME LOCAL 626

Mr. Taylor. We now have Hazel Dews and Delores Jones representing local 626.

Ms. Dews. Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, the subcommittee. My name is Hazel Dews, and I am the president of the Architect of the Capitol Local 626, representing some 700 employees. I would like to take this time to thank the subcommittee for this opportunity to testify before you. We have submitted testimony for the record, and we ask that it be included in the record.

Mr. Taylor. Without objection.

Fire Safety

Ms. Dews. I have been an employee of the Architect of the Capitol for 25 years. After the IG report on fire safety, we were very disturbed. We all should be concerned about security and safety. It affects everyone employed within these buildings.

Mr. Chairman, we requested a meeting with Mr. Hantman, but he failed to respond to our request. I do think we all know how devastating a fire can be, especially when you have equipment that does not work properly. This is what we have here in some of these buildings.

Mr. Chairman, we should all put security and safety on our top priority list. Thank you.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you, Ms. Dews.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Ms. Jones. My name is Delores Jones, Chief Steward for

Local 626.

Last Wednesday this committee discussed the need to increase security measures throughout the Capitol complex. The Architect of the Capitol stated in his budget report that terrorist activity throughout the world has increased. As a result of that, there is a heightened sensitivity toward threats to security on Capitol Hill.

Contracting Out

However, when the Architect was questioned by Congressman Hoyer about his plans for contracting out, the Architect stated that it would depend on the number of employees who took the buy-out.

Now, attached to our testimony we have a letter from Capitol Hill Police supporting us. Currently, the Capitol Police can readily identify custodial workers and laborers because of their daily interaction with each other. Some of these workers have been employed for the Architect for at least 20 years and have established a friendly relationship with the Capitol Police.

This interaction would not exist with contractors who experience high employee turnover. The Union and Capitol Hill Police believe that this lack of identity would compromise the Capitol Police's ability to provide adequate security and thus compromise security for all of us.

Also, the Architect stated in his budget report last Wednesday that he intends to offer buy-outs to bargaining unit employees. Should a high percentage of employees from our bargaining unit accept the offer and the Architect choose not to replace these workers, the union believes this will provide the groundwork for the Architect to begin contracting out.

Since 1993, the Architect of the Capitol has steadily decreased the number of custodial and laborer workers in all jurisdictions. In 1993, the House had a night custodial staff of 250. Today the House has approximately 160 night custodial workers. This is a 36 percent decrease in staff since 1993.

For instance, if an employee is normally lifting 100 pounds while performing his duties and now is lifting 200 pounds because he is now doing the work of two, sometimes three different people's work, you have a greater chance of becoming injured due to your increased workload.

In the past, we have had several employees die and become disabled since the downsizing of the night custodial staff. We have often asked ourselves if these deaths could have been avoided were it not for the amount of physical strain that they endured while working in this environment.

Staffing

On several occasions the union has made proposals to AOC management to resolve the staffing problems. The union made four proposals in May of 1998 that we believed would help resolve the problems of absenteeism and workplace injuries. The union proposed to management that a swing shift be established so that some day employees could perform some of the night duties, such as cleaning the banquet and committee rooms that were used during the day, rather than leaving those rooms for the night employees to do.

During the fiscal years 1997 and 1998, the House was appropriated $32,556,000 and $36,610,000 respectively, an increase of $4 million. However, none of this money was used to assist the individuals who do the tough jobs, and apparently none of that money was used for fire and safety protection systems.

We have not seen a significant increase in equipment, supplies or other materials that are necessary for us to perform our duties. The union is recommending that this committee appropriate funds to provide additional equipment, supplies, hire additional custodial workers and laborers and/or appropriate funds to pay overtime to current day employees who are willing to perform some of the duties normally assigned to night staff.

The union also requested that the superintendents be held accountable and justify the hiring of additional supervisory staff while decreasing the number of employees.

In summary, the union believes that the AOC must be more accountable to Congress, its visitors and its workers. TheAOC has been called the ``last plantation'' or a ``Third World agency'' and other nonflattering names. The leadership of this agency must change its attitude about worker safety and become a real team player when dealing with workplace issues.

To simply give reasons why things are not working or why the agency cannot hire additional staff does not serve the best interest of the agency or their employees. The union would like to see a more proactive attitude rather than a ``crisis management'' style of leadership.

Simply put, the employees of this agency want to feel proud to work for our Architect of the Capitol and to be an integral part of making this agency a success story.

The union should not have to file complaints and requests for inspections for obvious workplace hazards. The AOC should not have to be compelled by law to implement fire safety systems. This should be done because it is the right thing to do. These issues should be resolved when brought to the attention of the proper officials.

We hope that this testimony has been useful and informative. We sincerely hope that this committee fully considers our recommendations for improving the work environment in the House of Representatives and throughout the Capitol.

On behalf of the members of AFSCME Local 626, we would like to thank Chairman Taylor and all the members of this committee for your time and attention. We respectfully request that our testimony be entered as part of the official record.

The employees of the AOC look forward to working with you in the future.

Mr. Taylor. Without objection, the testimony will be entered into the record.

Mr. Pastor, do you have any questions?

Mr. Pastor. No. I want to thank you for coming forward and bringing your concerns. I think it is very important that even though we are Members of Congress we also have employees, and we have to make sure that people that are under our employ or within our employ have a safe environment. We thank you because safety concerns that you have are also our concerns. We also work here. So we are all on the same side on this one. So we appreciate you coming forward and giving us your testimony.

Ms. Jones. Okay. Thank you.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

Question. It was one year ago that AOC workers were photographed looking through trash in the Rayburn building for materials mistakenly thrown away in a Member's office. In the last year, in your opinion, has there been any increased sensitivity in the architect's office to workers' safety concerns?

Answer: No, AOC has not been sensitive to worker safety concerns. Example: When, Roll Call reported about legionnaire's disease, AOC stated it would review each sick record for employees who had been sick for more than six consecutive days in last six months. They asked the nurse to check each employee out. This procedure hasn't occurred among custodial or laborers, to this date.

AOC doesn't act unless complaints are filed with the Office of Compliance and/or OSHA.

Employees had to demand working gear from the AOC, required by OSHA. Some employees still don't have the proper working gear.

Employees have requested snow removal gear. There is still no response from AOC management.

Question. Can you address fundamentally why the House Recycling program doesn't work better?

Answer: The recycle program is not enforced by the superintendent's office. The congressional staff needs to have some kind of newsletter and general training regarding AOC Recycle goals.

The Recycle Coordinator is not trained properly. When they had a qualified recycle coordinator, she was let go, because she would not lie to Congress.

Members' staff are not informed about the recycle program, especially new members.

Custodial workers are blamed for the failing recycle program, however, custodial workers follow instruction given by their supervisors.

[Clerk's Note.--AFSCME Local 626 provided the following information for the Record:]

There are no Federal Grants or funding which our organization receives.

____

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

U.S. CAPITOL POLICE

WITNESS

J. CREEKMUR, REPRESENTING FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE LABOR COMMITTEE

Mr. Taylor. Next is Mr. Creekmur, Fraternal Order of Police Labor Committee and Mr. Gashel, who is from the National Federation of the Blind.

Mr. Creekmur.

Mr. Creekmur. Thank you. Chairman Taylor and Members of the

Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to testify regarding the appropriations for the United States Capitol Police Department. As head of the union for rank-and-file officers, I bring a new perspective to these proceedings. This is the first time a representative of the front-line members of our agency has ever testified in this setting, and I ask that this testimony be entered into the record.

Mr. Taylor. Without objection.

Mr. Creekmur. My fellow officers and I take our oaths and responsibilities to you and everyone else we serve and protect in the Capitol complex very seriously. We hope to inform you about some of the significant differences which, if properly addressed, can be resolved to improve your security.

Body Armor and Weapons

The events of last summer coupled with a continuing security threat have created an urgent need for improved weapons and protective body armor. The weapons and body armor are critical to each officer's survival. The need for ongoing training and proper distribution of manpower is important.

Our current body armor is more than a decade old in many cases. There are no continuing programs to assure proper fit or to keep pace with improved technology for body armor. We ask that you appropriate sufficient funds to replace all body armor and to ensure a continuing system of replacement and improvement.

Nearly a decade has passed since we acquired the 9mm weapons we now are using. Although the exchange of gunfire repeatedly wounded the man who attacked and killed two of my fellow officers last summer, he was able to continue his deadly actions and is still alive today. This incident has put very real doubts in the minds of all of us who rely on these handguns for protection. Since the acquisition of these guns, technology and experience have convinced many of us that a larger caliber weapon of new design must be secured now.

In October, the Congress passed a supplemental appropriation to provide improvements, which include body armor and weapons, along with other security enhancements. To date, we have not yet seen a single new vest or weapon. My fellow officers and I are deeply concerned about these improvements. I am constantly asked by my members about when the weapons and body armor will be delivered.

We had hoped that the needed equipment would be fielded to the officers by early spring of 1999. With the addition of 260 new officers to our Department and the depletion of the current stock of available 9mm weapons that we are currently using, it is crucial that funds be released before the spring of 1999 to purchase the new 40-caliber weapon and improved body armor.

Training

Training of our members has been significantly reduced as we have attempted to keep pace with increasing demands on our Department to respond to a wider variety of threats. It takes additional manpower to relieve officers who are in training. We need more instructors and better facilities to establish a comprehensive system of continuing education and training programs for our members.

Our officers assigned to stationary posts around the Capitol complex are the first line of defense on the perimeter of every building. They must be well equipped, well trained, and adequately staffed in order to improve their survival and yours.

Vehicles

The Patrol Division has suffered reductions in the fleet that they use. There are not enough marked vehicles to provide for adequate mobilization and protection of the Congress. The lack of specialized vehicles, such as an equipment truck for the Containment Emergency Response Team, which is known as CERT, reduces their effectiveness. We need proper emergency equipment on all motorcycles and bicycles for the officers and for traffic safety.

The Department is in need of a new central facility to provide for improved storage and maintenance of fleet vehicles. We need to also expand and improve on our training operations within a central location. At present our Department and its many units are scattered across Capitol Hill.

I would like to request that any appropriations with regard to this testimony be released to the Department so that they can expeditiously resolve these issues.

So this, sir, concludes my testimony. I will be happy to answer any questions.

[The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

Mr. Taylor. What gun are you using, the 9mm?

Mr. Creekmur. The 9mm caliber weapon, which is the type of weapon that----

Mr. Taylor. I understand, but what make.

Mr. Creekmur. Smith and Wesson.

Mr. Taylor. What are you thinking about the 40-millimeter?

Mr. Creekmur. That has yet to be determined by the range personnel. The process for that is that a selected group of rank-and-file officers would go down and test a variety of weapons for that particular caliber, and the one that is selected by the rank and file will be the one that the range personnel will submit to management, and they will make a selection from them.

Mr. Taylor. The 40-millimeter, there are several brands that have a good stable weapon, I know.

Do you have any questions, Ed?

Mr. Pastor. Not a question, but I think last week when the Chief was before us----

Mr. Creekmur. Right.

Mr. Pastor [continuing]. As I remember his testimony, the group is working on selecting a weapon that is appropriate and also the best way to obtain it.

Mr. Creekmur. Correct.

Mr. Pastor. I think someone on the subcommittee asked the question of protection, and we were told that every officer will be provided the protective gear. We were reassured it will be of the latest technology and the best, but the chief and the Department have to follow the proper procedures. But I will tell you it is my assessment that everything is at least on-line to give you the protective gear and also the appropriate weapons.

Mr. Taylor. I believe you met with the staff, and the Chief has indicated that he would try to get the weapons out of the current funds if we haven't secured the enforcement funds, and of course we were taking that up right with the Visitor Center to try to get all the committees that have to approve it put together so that we won't take so long to get those funds. Of course, it focuses on the light-weight vest that is protective and worthwhile. Especially since more officers are placed outside the door to try to get a check before people go through the metal detectors. It would be tough to wear the heavy vests. We need to get them as light as we can get them.

I hope that we will see some records on the test, because if the test is not beneficial for most caliber weapons, then you know it is false security.

Mr. Creekmur. Right. That is true.

Mr. Taylor. But I hope we can get the best one available, and our committee certainly will be working with you on that.

Mr. Creekmur. Sir, we appreciate it. And the key as far as protective body armor goes, it matters on how heavy, but what most officers find more comfortable is making sure the body armor is fitted to that particular person. Because what is large on me may not be a large on someone else, and that is what gives them, I guess, false security. Some officers choose not to wear it because it just does not fit properly, and it rises up and so on and so forth, so therefore the proper fit, by fitting each officer to the body armor, would be more beneficial and give them better protection.

Mr. Taylor. That is a good point. We lost a park ranger in my district who was wearing a vest. It hit just below, and I don't know about the fitting, but I imagine that was one of the problems.

Mr. Creekmur. Yes, it is.

Mr. Taylor. Well, thank you very much. We appreciate you gentlemen coming in.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you.

[Questions from Mr. Hoyer and responses follow:]

Question. You mentioned that the Capitol Police needs improved training facilities. Can you elaborate on that, paying particular attention to describing the condition of your current facilities?

Response. Our current ``training academy'' is located in Annex II. It consists of two classrooms on its third floor and one located on its seventh floor. Each classroom can accommodate 24 students.

One small office on the seventh floor has been converted to a locker room for male staff. Female staff has lockers within their office cubicles. There are half lockers for the students in the class rooms. The officers must use public restrooms to change clothes.

The classroom and field equipment needed to train at these locations is old, but serviceable. There is an immediate need to replace and upgrade nearly all of our classroom presentation devices, communications equipment, vehicles and field uniforms and equipment used for exercises.

The current situation allows the Department to train a minimum number of recruits to maintain current strength. It does not permit regular in-service training for officers who are serving on posts after graduating from the academy. These equipment and space constraints have degraded our ability to remain sharp in the field after graduation. It hinders continuing education of our members regarding threats and responses.

Now that the Congress has authorized the addition of 260 more officers to the Department, it will be impossible for the Department to provide appropriate training for the larger classes that are anticipated to begin this year. This will further reduce the consideration given to continuing education for field officers.

I believe it is imperative that the Department be provided with a permanent facility which is designed to train 200 students simultaneously. Further, that it is designed from this perspective to include parking; classrooms; locker & shower rooms; staff offices; equipment and storage. For too long, our training goals have been dictated by physical constraints not over our control. Those constraints rob us, and the people we protect, of significant advantages over terrorists and other national and international threats. Additionally, these restraints hinder our ability to deal with ever present local crime on the Capitol grounds.

Question. Last year Congress appropriated $106 million for security enhancements, to fund procurement of new weapons, body armor, and other equipment. In the procurement process, does Management consult with the union and rank-and-file for input?

Response. No.

____

Wednesday, February 10, 1999.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

WITNESS

JAMES GASHEL, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND

Mr. Taylor. Mr. Gashel, we are glad to have you representing the National Federation of the Blind.

Mr. Gashel. I am James Gashel. I am director of governmental affairs for the National Federation of the Blind. Let me begin with my introduction of our organization. We represent blind men and women throughout the United States who are members of the National Federation of the Blind.

As a membership organization of blind people, we are really vitally concerned with the amount that you would appropriate to the books for the blind and physically handicapped program of the Library of Congress. Those members who have accompanied me here today evidence that concern because, in fact, the Library, in our case, is far more than a library. When you think of a library, you usually think of a place where they store books. In our case, libraries are our access to knowledge. We can't buy a braille book at a bookstore; obviously can't read a print book that you would find in most bookstores; and audio books that you find are oftentimes the abridged versions of that which is found at a bookstore. So the service we need is definitely a unique service that the Library of Congress provides directly to this important group of citizens.

Let me just say that the fiscal year 2000 request of the Library is really almost $48 million. In terms of the cost per individual, it is about $61 and change to provide the service. That provides books like this. This is half of an autobiography of Abigail Adams by C.W. Akers. So the complete book would be twice this size, and they produce this in braille and send it to the borrowers throughout the United States. This is very typical of what these books look like.

The recorded media use cassette machines that are especially designed for the program and the ordinary tape cassette that you are familiar with seeing.

Now, if the budget request is approved, then the Library would be able to produce 2,400 books and 77 popular magazines. That is not very many compared to the 62,000 books that are expected to be copyrighted in ink print this year. Therefore, we desperately need at least the $48 million that has been requested, and we would still be lagging behind the number of books that appear in print.

Mr. Chairman, I should say that there is one possible solution to this that might be looked at, given the fact that we are definitely well into the digital age. Let me first of all just mention in the fiscal year 1997 appropriations bill, an amendment was included to the Copyright Act which made it easier for the Library of Congress to be able to reproduce books like this without getting the advanced permission of the publishers to be able to do that.

We envision a further amendment in the Copyright Act, and we are talking with staff and members of the Judiciary Committee, the Library of Congress, and the publishing community at this time to accomplish this. This proposed amendment would require that in submitting their material for copyright to the Library of Congress, the publishers would also submit digital electronic text in a standard format prescribed by the National Library Service for the Blind to the Library of Congress. If that were to occur, we would envision an electronic reservoir of books, which would include anything that is copyrighted in this country. The materials could then be reproduced and actually e-mailed to a digital machine, which could allow a blind individual to read the output in braille rather than in the format of a braille volume. This may make a book like this become a dinosaur eventually, and it would give people like me access to the totality of the 62,000 books that are published in ink print every year.

Just in conclusion, let me say that in a society in which we are depending increasingly on access to knowledge, blind people must not be left behind, because we want to be able to compete on terms of equality. Your approval of the Library's budget request will help us do that, and consideration of a copyright amendment would also help us do that.

Finally, I know about the program that Mr. Pastor mentioned to deliver daily newspapers to blind people. I would be happy to discuss that with you, too, because, again, it is exciting new technology that promises to open great doors to blind people. Thank you very much.

Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We certainly appreciate your appearance here today and all of your colleagues who are

gathered.
    [The information follows:]

[GRAPHIC(S) NOT AVAILABLE IN TIFF FORMAT]

    Mr. Taylor. Mr. Pastor, do you have a question?
    Mr. Pastor. I would like to pursue that question I had earlier. I know that access is a big issue, and at least in Arizona they were proposing it be available at the libraries in Phoenix and in Tucson and in Flagstaff. Those would be ideal locations where people would call, and get this information. The cost was worth the investment. If you want to add to it, I would appreciate it. I don't know where the Library of Congress would fall in this whole thing.
    Mr. Gashel. They potentially could fall into this, or there are other laws, such as the Library Services and Technology Act, through--which is under the Labor-Health and Human Services education appropriations bill, where I believe about $140 million is appropriated to the States for library services.
    Let me say that the service called Newsline for the Blind is a wonderful way of delivering electronic text from the publisher of the newspaper, let us say, or some other publication that is of short-term duration, directly to the telephone of a blind user. I use this service. We have it in Baltimore, and I can read on the telephone every day at 6 in the morning the New York Times, the Chicago Tribune, USA Today, the Wall Street Journal and The Washington Post and the Baltimore Sun. That is probably better newspaper access than you all have.
    I sit there and I use a speaker telephone and do it, and that is what they are talking about in Arizona. We are setting one of these sites up in Charlotte, North Carolina, basically as we speak, and our goal is to have a penetration of this service in every single State and, quite frankly, in every single congressional district in this country, and probably this service is in about half the congressional districts right now.
    And you are right, the amount of money to set this up is very, very small. The first-year cost of setting up one site is about $50,000, no more than that, and then it runs at less than half of that on a continuous year-to-year basis, and it serves a wide dialing area. You can have a couple of sites and serve all of Arizona, for example, and pretty well hit the population pretty well.
    Illinois has this service, almost everywhere in the whole State. Few other States are like that. And eventually, it will be something that can be nationwide. It is really a supplement to the Library of Congress service, which is books, and this service can deliver short-term publications like newspapers. You can't go to the trouble of brailling a newspaper and get it out to blind people within a day. You can't do it within a month, let alone a day. But with this service, audio text over the telephone, you can do it within minutes.
    Mr. Pastor. Thank you very much.
    Mr. Taylor. Thank you. We certainly appreciate it.
    Mr. Gashel. Thank you.

Mr. Taylor. We appreciate each of you coming in, and we will certainly look at this appropriation carefully.

We will now adjourn the legislative appropriations hearing subject to the call of the Chair.

W I T N E S S E S

I N D E X

---------- --
