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**About the Cover:**
Old Blue was a used minivan that my wife and I bought in 2001 in response to the growing demands of a family of five. The center seat had two built-in child seats that could be tucked away neatly when not in use, and the seat could be folded down to create a table for picnics in the car on rainy days. It was a well-loved vehicle with many memories of cross-country trips, camping, kayaking, and moving large furniture.

Our family’s last trip in Old Blue was from Pittsburgh International Airport to State College after returning from the 2015 American Library Association meeting in San Francisco. Fifteen years and close to 200,000 miles had finally taken its toll. We heard a pinging sound from under the hood that got louder and louder as we went. A mechanic in Altoona gave us a 50/50 chance of making it home. That sound created much anxiety followed by relief when we finally pulled into our driveway. Now lest you think that I’m a complete pessimist by using this metaphor to discuss our organization, there is actually more to this story, so read on.

Looking Under the Hood

I assume that you are reading this column, because you care about government information or you may even have some interest in the future of the Government Documents Roundtable (GODORT). If you are not interested in the latter, I would still like to encourage you to continue reading and possibly find ways to engage in this discussion.

I am convinced that the library profession needs an organization that champions government information. As I stated in the close of my last column, our profession needs to have an organization whose singular mission is to inspire government information specialists to develop services and collections. If this is indeed our focus, then we need to develop a strategy that will enable us to build a structure that we can support with our available resources.

What Is the Best Structure?

For many years I thought that GODORT should be organized around the classic themes of librarianship such as: reference, cataloging, instruction, and collection development. This idea was not unheard of and was actually suggested in 1993. Others have suggested that we organize ourselves around types of government information.

GODORT as it currently stands is a complex hybrid of both of these approaches. For the sake of clarity, I have grouped our organization into five functional categories (see figure 1):

- **Taskforces**: international, federal, state, and local
- **Topical standing committees**: education, cataloging, rare and endangered government documents, and government information for children.
- **Scholarly communication and advocacy**: program, publications, and legislation
- **Internal standing committees**: awards, bylaws, conference, development, membership, and nomination
- **Executive committees**: executive board and steering committee

Why these categories? I hope as you continue to read this column that it will become clearer, but to summarize, I would argue that this framework is based on the complex working relationships of the groups from our documentation. More importantly, it is also based on how leadership and membership of these groups are formed for specific purposes.

Strategy: Action or Forum

An important consideration as we work toward developing a strategic focus and nimble organization is the tension between seeing ourselves as an action-oriented group and/or a venue to discuss and inform. Our current organizational documentation clearly indicates that both of these are values, but the complexity of our structure, and changes over time have made it difficult to see how these are carried out.

For example, the Policy and Procedures Manual states that the purpose of the taskforce was to provide a “venue to discuss and inform.” However, our bylaws indicate that taskforces were intended to be “action-oriented groups.” So which is it? The answer lies in this complex system of liaisons and committee appointments, as well as some historical background.

Taskforce coordinators, as elected officials, are given the responsibility of assigning liaisons to the standing committees responsible for topics, scholarship, and advocacy. For many years the main focus of taskforce meetings was an update that highlighted the issues relevant to the specific types of government information.

From these taskforce meetings “action-oriented” issues were identified and it was the responsibility of the liaison to...
communicate these to the standing committee. I would infer that it was the expectation of those who designed the organization that the liaisons to the committees would also be actively involved in the work of the committee, providing context as they address the specific task identified by the taskforce.

So what happened? Well in short, the awareness mechanism—taskforce updates—were eliminated, making it difficult to find a forum where these issues were discussed. The awareness and action-oriented model that existed was short-circuited and the liaisons became merely communicators.

So am I suggesting that we restart the updates as the solution? Or that we simply eliminate the liaisons, thus creating fewer appointments and demands on our limited resources. Certainly not. Those are only patchwork solutions. This is our opportunity to look afresh at our purpose to see what roles we want to play as an organization. I submit that this will fall on a continuum of awareness and action.

**Structure: Permanence and Flexibility**

We currently have an extremely flat organization with many permanent parts. The real question we need to answer is: What parts of our organization need to be permanent and what parts should be flexible? What do I mean by permanence and flexibility?

Permanent structures have common characteristics, including:

- a general purpose for existing;
- mechanisms for creating groups to address specific tasks, typically; and
- a complex organizational structure with well-defined roles.

Flexible structures on the other hand have very different features. Often they

- are created for a specific purpose or task;
- have a well-defined duration; and
- are a simple task-oriented group with little organizational structure.

Quite simply, we need to identify what parts of our organization are essential and what can be set up on an as-needed basis. So what should be permanent? It all depends on how flat we want our organization, which in turn is dependent upon how involved our members want to be.
From the Chair

Support
As I stated earlier, our structure and strategies need to match our available resources. GODORT’s current structure each year requires us to fill 72 appointed and 29 elected positions from a membership of about 500. We recognize that appointments and elections are important considerations for involvement from our member’s institutions; however, I would submit that this is not a sustainable model.

We have talked about virtual meetings as a way to address the challenges of participation. It certainly would provide us with greater flexibility for those who cannot afford to attend Midwinter Meetings. However, I have some concerns about this being seen as the panacea of our organization. We need to be very honest about what we want our purpose to be.

Government information is what makes our brand unique. Our profession already has rich, historical associations that deal with the classic themes of librarianship, often surpassing our own efforts. This is why past leaders in our organization have encouraged us to develop stronger ties with groups like RUSA and ALCTS. What we want to do with this brand is up to our membership.

Conclusion
My wife and I recently completed the process of replacing Old Blue. Our first thought was to get another minivan, but we began to think about the changes that were occurring in our family. One of our daughters is now in college and two of our teenagers are learning to drive. Given all that, it made more sense to replace the van with a less expensive sedan.

The point of this metaphor is that we still need a structure, but we may need to consider how we have changed as an organization and what role GODORT needs to play in the library profession to determine what our structure should be.
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The student papers issue of DttP is always one of my favorites and I know that many of you look forward to it as well. It’s an opportunity to learn from the students who will soon become our colleagues. It’s also a great opportunity to be reminded about the diversity of government information and programs. This year, I’m happy to present articles about campaign finance, the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program, declassified documents, NYC bike infrastructure, the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the creation of holidays and memorial days by the federal government.

As a reminder for anyone who is teaching a government information class (or those of you who know someone who is teaching one), we rely on faculty members to nominate student papers. So keep an eye out for well-written papers on interesting or unique topics. We generally send a call for submissions in the summer, but will accept submissions at any time. (Just make a note that it’s for our student papers issue!)

I’ll keep my editor’s corner relatively short this month, since there is a lot of great content in this issue and I know that nobody actually reads the introduction. (You’re welcome to prove me wrong! But even I admit to not reading the editor’s piece in most journals, and I know how much work goes into writing them!) One of the quirks of the editorial calendar is that I write these pieces around two months before you receive them. So, even though I’m writing this before the FDL conference and DLC meeting, you’ll receive it months after I’ve asked you to consider writing up your presentation for submission. Which is a great segue:

DttP is only as good as the articles that are submitted! So consider writing about that really innovative program you’re doing, or about that partnership with your local community organization. Even better, consider writing about something that didn’t work or an idea that you’ve had about how to make government information work better for non-experts. Have an idea that doesn’t fit those topics? That’s OK! As long as it’s related to government information, we’re interested.
Here Come the Bicycles!
The Rise of New York City’s Bicycling Infrastructure

Jodi Shaw

All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.

—Arthur Schopenhauer

If you live in New York City, you may have noticed an uptick in the number of bicyclists recently. The quip “build it and they will come” has never been more true than in the case of bike lanes and bicyclists in New York City. In the seven-year period from 2006 to 2013, the New York City Department of Transportation added a total of 366.4 bicycle lanes to all five boroughs, with Brooklyn adding the most: 127.2 miles.

During this same time period, the city’s bicycling commuter rate (people who use a bicycle as their primary mode of transportation) rose from .6 percent of the population in 2009 to 1.2 percent in 2013, signifying a 100% increase in bicycle commuters and adding an estimated 10,000 bike commuters in 2013 alone. Since these numbers do not include bicyclists who ride on a bicycle only part of the week, or ride a bike to mass transit and then use transit for the longer part of their commute, the number of actual bicyclists on the streets of New York City is probably much higher.

The trend is nationwide. According to a US Census report by Brian McKenzie, “the number of U.S. workers who traveled to work by bicycle increased by 60.8% (from about 488,000 in 2000 to about 786,000 in 2008–2012), a larger percentage increase than that of any other commuting mode.”

Major metropolitan areas in particular have seen vast increases in numbers of cyclists on the road. From 2000 to 2012, bicycle commuting in Chicago increased 214%, Denver by 200%, Los Angeles by 63%, and San Francisco by 90%. The increases for smaller metro areas such as Buffalo and St. Louis are even higher, at 269% and 233% respectively.

Since the rates of bicycle commuting for earlier years (such as 1980, 1990, and 2000) are not statistically different from one another, the rapid increase in bicycle commuting in US metropolitan areas in recent years can only be attributed to recent federal mandates that support the expansion of bicycle infrastructure in these areas. Two acts in particular, the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) and The Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA-21) have played a major role in the increase of bicyclists on the road.

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act

Signed in 1991 by George H.W. Bush, ISTEA sought to create a “National Intermodal Transportation System,” which specifically includes “bicycle transportation and pedestrian walkways” as one of many types of projects eligible for funds under the NHS (National Highway System).

ISTEA amended §101(a) of Title 23 (Highways) of the United States Code (U.S.C.) to define “transportation enhancement activities” to include “provision of facilities for pedestrians and bicycles” and the “preservation of abandoned railway corridors (including the conversion and use thereof for pedestrian or bicycle trails).” Significantly, ISTEA further amended Title 23 to state that “no bicycle project may be carried out under this section unless the Secretary has determined that such bicycle project will be principally for transportation, rather than recreation, purposes,” effectively giving bicycles the same status as motor vehicles when considering future transportation initiatives.

ISTEA and the City

ISTEA specifically mentioned the development of bicycle infrastructure in metropolitan areas by modifying 23 U.S.C. §134(a) (Metropolitan Transportation Planning) to read (italics added):

It is in the national interest to encourage and promote the development of transportation systems embracing
various modes of transportation in a manner which will efficiently maximize mobility of people and goods within and through urbanized areas and minimize transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution . . . metropolitan planning organizations, in cooperation with the State, shall develop transportation plans and programs for the development of transportation facilities.11

ISTEA further amended 23 U.S.C. §217 (Bicycle Transportation and Pedestrian Walkways) to allow states to apportion funds for “construction of pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities” and “non-construction projects related to safe bicycle use” (one can assume this pertains to things such as safety posters, maps and signage).12 ISTEA also allowed each state to appoint a “state bicycle and pedestrian coordinator” to promote and facilitate the increased use of non-motorized modes of transportation, develop facilities for the use of pedestrians and bicyclists and public education, and create safety programs for using such facilities.13

The Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century

Seven years later—in 1998—Bill Clinton signed The Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA-21), further clarifying 23 U.S.C. §134(a) to read (changes in italics):

The such plans and programs for each metropolitan area shall provide for the development and integrated management and operation of transportation systems and facilities (including pedestrian walkways and bicycle transportation facilities).14

TEA-21 builds upon ISTEA by providing “funding, planning, and policy tools necessary to create more walkable and bicycle-friendly communities.”15

As a result of ISTEA and TEA-21, a host of US cities now enjoy a well-designed expanded bicycle infrastructure, and, as a result of said expansion, a large uptick in bicycling commuters.

Sharing the Road—Controversy over New York City’s Bike Lanes

Not everyone in New York City is pleased with such advances in metropolitan bicycle infrastructures. In 2013, New York City Council Speaker Christine Quinn referred to bike lanes as one of those “things you shouldn’t discuss at dinner parties,” alongside money, politics and religion.16 She wasn’t kidding. During the 2009 and 2013 mayoral campaigns, the bike lanes—a legacy of the Bloomberg administration—ranked right up there with unemployment, income inequality, affordable housing, and taxes as a hot-button issue.17 In 2009 mayoral candidate William Thompson said he would “rip out” the bike lane on Grand Street. Four years later, in the 2013 race he recanted, saying he had “no intention” of removing lanes, and would even consider expanding bike projects.18

Thompson was not the only one doing an about-face. In April of 2012, (then) public advocate Bill de Blasio voiced his ire against the city’s rapid expansion of bike lanes by calling Janette Sadik-Kahn, Bloomberg’s DOT Commissioner and architect of the infrastructure expansion, a “radical.”19 However, in 2013 as candidate for Mayor, he voiced his support for the expansion of bike lanes.20

These swift changes in opinion about the bike lanes may indicate a turning point in the consciousness of New York City regarding the bike lanes, signaling a reluctant acceptance. By the year 2013, 1 percent of the New York City population were using the lanes for the bicycle commuting purpose they were designed for.21 It may well be that as we head into 2015, the worst of what the League of American Bicyclists call “Bikelash” may be over in New York City.22

History of the New York City Bicycling Infrastructure

Although the early millennium saw a rapid expansion of New York City’s bicycling infrastructure, the origins of a formal infrastructure date back to the late 19th century. The British Broadcasting System website credits a blacksmith named Kirkpatrick Macmillan with inventing of the first pedal bicycle in 1839.23

Less than 50 years later, bicycling was a popular activity used both for recreation and utilitarian purposes.24 By 1896, there were over 150 bicycle factories in the United States producing over 1,000 different makes of bicycles for men, women, and children.25

In the city of Brooklyn, at the height of the nation’s bike craze, a 5.5 mile stretch running from Windsor Terrace to Coney Island became home to the country’s first bike path.26 The Ocean Parkway bike path remains in active use today.

Two years later, the Brooklyn Parks Department built the first bike shelters and bike racks, and new bike paths were built along Pelham Parkway (Bronx) and Riverside Park and Drive (Manhattan).27 In response to the increase in bicycling activity, the 1900s and 1910s also saw the first bike patrols in Central and Prospect Parks.28

Perhaps the most significant contributions to the New York City bicycle infrastructure came in the mid-20th century.
by a public official known more for his pro-automobile policies and practices. Robert Moses, under whom the New York City metropolitan area accumulated more highway miles than Los Angeles, was the master builder of the Brooklyn-Queens Expressway, the Triborough Bridge, the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, the West Side Highway and the Long Island parkways, among others. Moses was—until the Bloomberg era—the city’s biggest proponent of and contributor to the New York City’s bicycling infrastructure.

In the 1930s when New York City Parks officials declared the use of city streets and boulevards for bicycling to be “dangerous to the bicyclist and the use of walks in the parks dangerous to the pedestrian” Moses responded by opening the (then) defunct drive west of the Mall in Central Park to bicyclists, painting lines to separate bicyclists and skaters. Bike paths even figured into Moses’ 1940 infamous Belt Parkway road, resulting in more than 31 miles of waterfront bike paths. In 1938 Moses opened a 2.5 mile section of the then defunct Long Island Motor Parkway for exclusive use as a biking path. Subsequently, the Parks Department built almost 60 miles of bicycle paths in city parks. These paths were not designed for commuting, but for the purpose of “securing mental relaxation and physical exercise,” while providing a “reasonable assurance of safety.”

Many politicians since have taken up the cause. In 1970, Mayor John V. Lindsay showed his support for bike lanes by riding down Fifth Avenue with 1000 people. In 1971 Ed Koch (then Congressman Koch), hoped to encourage cyclists by pushing for “official and exclusive bike lanes.” He recognized the importance of bike lanes as part of the city’s transportation infrastructure (as opposed to recreational use) and in 1973 he acknowledged that in order for New York City to have a “balanced” transportation system, “the bicycle must be included as an integral part.”

As Mayor, Koch, faced with a citywide transit strike, installed bike lanes on Fifth, Sixth, Seventh Avenues, and Broadway. During the strike, emergency bike lanes were installed on all the bridges and bike commuters were estimated to have increased by 200,000 riders. Although most of these riders returned to mass transit when the strike ended, the percentage of bike commuters remained higher after the transit strike than it was before.

Moses and Koch’s bike paths were not wasted on the public. In 1980 the New York City DOT began monitoring bicycle travel at several points; the data collected showed that daily bicycle use between 1980 and 1995 had increased by 124%. In response, the Mayoral Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Council was formed in 1995. The goals of the council included: interagency coordination in advancing the network; providing a forum for the cycling community to express its concerns; incorporating bicycle facilities, where feasible and appropriate, in all future capital projects; and promoting the enforcement of traffic rules.

1994 marked the beginning of the Bicycle Network Development (BND) Project, a joint effort of the Departments of City Planning (DCP) and Transportation (DOT), joined in 1996 by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

The BND Project is partially financed through the federally mandated Congestion Mitigation Air Quality (CMAQ) program of TEA-21. The CMAQ provides funding for the planning, design and development of bikeways as a means of improving air quality, reducing energy costs, reducing congestion on existing roadways, and helping to provide for lower overall transportation costs. The goal of the BND is to increase bicycle ridership in New York City by implementing and maintaining New York City’s “on- and off-street bicycle network; improve cycling safety; improve bicycle access on bridges and mass transit; and institutionalize cycling in public and private organizations.”

In 1997 the BND released two documents of vital importance to their stated goals:

1. The first New York City Bicycling Map, which, as of the release of the 2014 version, has printed and distributed over 3,000,000 copies of the map.
2. The “New York City Bicycle Master Plan,” released by the New York City Department of City Planning, which is the final report of the first phase of the BND.

In 2007, the Bloomberg administration revealed its dedication to building a better bicycle infrastructure when it unveiled “PlaNYC,” which sought to create a “greener, greater New York.” A key element of PlaNYC is transportation. To that end, the New York City DOT, under the auspices of Commissioner Janette Sadik-Khan, released its strategic plan in 2008. Entitled “Sustainable Streets: Strategic Plan for the New York City Department of Transportation 2008 and Beyond,” the plan outlines its goal to “double the number of bicycle commuters by 2015.” To that end, it sought to make bicycling safer and more convenient by installing more bicycle lanes and more bicycle parking.

The follow-up report by the DOT, “Sustainable Streets 2013 and Beyond” said the city had met its goal of doubling bicycle commuters, a year early. In 2014, DOT stated its ongoing intention to: “accelerate the growth of safe cycling by providing a system of bicycle routes that traverse and connect all..."
five boroughs” and create a “dense, fine-grained network of bike lanes in communities where cycling is already a popular mode of transportation.”

Today, there are only 3 major water crossings in the metropolitan area that do not have a bike lane: the Verrazano-Narrows Bridge, the Bronx-Whitestone, and the Throgs Neck.

Modern New York City Bicycle Infrastructure Design

Designing a bike lane for a use in a city as congested as New York City is not a simple matter of throwing down green paint and arrows on the side of a roadway. Retrofitting existing roads, already cramped with moving and parked vehicles and other pedestrians, requires careful planning and forethought. Over the years a number of best practices have emerged. These practices have been compiled and outlined by the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

AASHTO, which bills itself as “the voice of transportation,” is a nonprofit, nonpartisan association representing highway and transportation departments in the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. It has a primary goal of fostering the development, operation, and maintenance of an integrated national transportation system.

The Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) 282-page manual on bike lane design relies heavily on AASHTO’s guidelines and goes into great detail about width standards; cross section design; bike lanes on roads with no curb/no gutter vs. roads with parking; retrofitting bicycle lanes on existing streets; managing reduced width lanes for motorists due to installation of bike lanes; removal, narrowing or reconfiguration of parking; bike lanes at intersections; and case studies from various municipalities.

New York City utilizes a variety of bike lane designs, although the language used to designate lane designs varies depending on which document you look at. The New York City Bicycle Master Plan names the three bike lane designs as: Multi-use, On-Street Bicycle Lanes, and Signed Bicycle Routes.

Transportation Alternatives (TA) is a nonprofit advocacy group that focuses on transportation issues, as part of its mission to reclaim New York City streets from the automobile and to promote bicycling, walking, and public transit. TA publishes a “Bike Lane Primer” to illustrate the different paths. The primer breaks down the lanes into three separate “classes” as follows:

Class 1 Bike Paths

Physically Protected Path Or “Cycle-Track”
Street Layout: Sidewalk—Bike Lane—Painted Buffer—Parked Cars—Vehicle Lane
Where: 9th Avenue in Manhattan or Grand Street in Manhattan
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Green Lines

Bi-Directional Protected Path
Street Layout: Sidewalk—Bi-Directional Bike Lane—Painted Buffer—Parked Cars—Vehicle Lane
Where: Tillary Street in Brooklyn between the exit of the Brooklyn Bridge and Cadman Plaza West, Prospect Park West and Kent Avenue in Brooklyn

Class 2 Bike Paths

Buffered Bike Lane
Street Layout: Sidewalk—Parked Cars—Bike Lane—Painted Buffer—Vehicle Lane
Where: DeKalb Avenue in Brooklyn or Lafayette Street in Manhattan
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Red Lines

Standard Painted Bike Lane
Street Layout: Sidewalk—Parked Cars—Bike Lane—Vehicle Lane or Sidewalk—Green Bike Lane—Vehicle Lane
Where: 20th Street in Manhattan or Prince Street in Manhattan
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Red Lines

Class 3 Bike Paths

Shared Lane ‘Sharrows’
Street Layout: Vehicle Lane with Bicycle Markings on Pavement to Indicate Shared Space
Where: 5th Avenue North of Carroll Street in Brooklyn or Henry Street at Congress Street in Brooklyn
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Yellow Lines
Signed Route
Street Layout: Bicycle Signs Marking
Designated Bike Route
Where: Bay Street in Staten Island
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Yellow Lines

Greenway Path, A.K.A. “Multi-Use” Path
Shared bicycle and pedestrian paths, separated from motor vehicle traffic. There are more than 100 miles of greenways in NYC and hundreds more are planned.
Where: Along the Hudson River in Manhattan or the Southern Waterfront of the Bronx
On the NYC Bike Map: Solid Green Lines

Bicycles and the Sharing Economy
Bike sharing programs allow users to pick up a bicycle at any self-serve bike station and return it to any other bike station located within the system’s service area, enabling them to make “short distance point-to-point trips.” Urban bike share programs rely on a bicycling infrastructure for their operation, and play a part in encouraging the use of bicycles as a means of transport. In May of 2013, New York City launched its first bike-sharing program called CitiBike. In July 2013, CitiBike’s second full month of operation, there were 14,185 annual members. One year later, in July 2014, membership had risen to 93,501 members—almost a 300% increase.

Safety
Rules and regulations for bicycle riding in New York City were established as early as the earliest infrastructure. In the late 19th century, as bicycling became more popular, the New York City Parks Department responded by creating rules and regulations for bicycles. These rules included requiring all bicyclists to register with the Parks Department and wear a badge, and, much like today, all riders were required to wear “lighted lamps after sundown,” and maintain speed limits of 12 miles per hour on the Ocean Parkway bike path. Today, bicycles are considered “vehicles” that must obey all New York City traffic rules, and cyclists have the same rights, privileges, and duties as other vehicular traffic.

Conclusion
There is no doubt that investing in a bicycle infrastructure is largely responsible for the increased use of bicycles as a means of transportation in New York City and beyond. Cities beyond the US that have invested significantly in a bicycle infrastructure have all enjoyed an increase in ridership; Copenhagen and Toronto (for example) have experienced an increase of 50% and 270% respectively in bicycle ridership after making serious investments in infrastructure.

With 54% of the world’s population living in cities, a rate expected to grow to 66 percent by 2050, investing in a less automobile-centric, diversified transportation infrastructure makes sense. In many cities it is no longer feasible to keep adding automobiles to already congested roadways. Bicycles are a relatively safe, cost-effective way to decrease congestion. In fact, according to estimates by TA, per mile traveled, bicycle riding costs the frequent cyclist less than half as much as mass transit and only one-quarter as much as driving. Investing in an infrastructure to accommodate bicycle commuters clearly fulfills ISTEA’s mission to “efficiently maximize mobility of people and goods within and through urbanized areas and minimize transportation-related fuel consumption and air pollution.”

The data clearly suggests that increased bicycle ridership is one solid measure we can take to ensure that our ever-growing global population, increasingly concentrated in urban areas, remains mobile.

Jodi Shaw (jshaw@pratt.edu), Pratt Institute School of Information and Library Science.
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Citizens of the United States hold many constitutional rights, including the right to vote, the right to bear arms, and the right to peaceably assemble. An unofficial “right” expected by many in today’s society is the “right to know,” which is supported by legislation such as the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), U.S.C. Title 44, and the Open Government Initiative. A 2007 amendment to FOIA notes: “the American people firmly believe that our system of government must itself be governed by a presumption of openness.”1 This is supported by the Obama administration, which maintains “our democratic principles require that the American people be informed of the activities of their Government.”2 This perceived right to know, however, is not applicable to all areas of government information.

The government often claims “national security” to protect governmental actions and documents from public knowledge. When this argument is used for specific information such as military actions, many citizens—though they may not appreciate the secrecy—understand the decision. In other cases, the public is less accepting of classified government information. A 2015 New York Times opinion piece on secret negotiations in Congress argued: “National security secrecy may be appropriate to protect us from our enemies; it should not be used to protect our politicians from us.”3 However, several types of information can legally be classified as privileged or confidential under FOIA.4

This paper will explore when and how the government justifies information as “classified,” when that information is released to the public, how easily the public can then access that information, what type of information can be requested, outline the options available for access, evaluate the limitations of current legislation, and identify potential obstacles to accessing declassified information.

Historical background

FOIA, passed in 1966, is arguably the most important piece of legislation regarding public access to unclassified and declassified information. Previous to the Act’s passage, the government had “wide authority to restrict access to perceived sensitive government information.”5 The Act has been amended four times since its original passage, which has helped it remain relevant in today’s changing information world. For example, the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendments of 1996 expanded FOIA to include electronic communications and required online reading rooms for government agencies.6 Without this amendment, the Act could have become irrelevant for today’s born digital government documents.

Title 44 of the United States Code, enacted in 1968, further expanded public access to information. The title, which addresses public printing and documents, includes specific sections on the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA), the Government Printing Office, the Federal Depository Library Program, the Disposal of Records, and Access to Federal Electronic Information.7 Similar to FOIA, Title 44 has been revised throughout the years, most recently in 2002, to stay up-to-date with current communications technology.

Following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, many policies—including the administration of FOIA—were amended to provide increased protection for government information.8 As the events of 2001 receded into history and a new administration took power, the federal government has again been making strides to increase public access to government information by passing new legislation that strengthens the power of FOIA, including the Openness Promotes Effectiveness in Our National (OPEN) Government Act of 2007 and the OPEN FOIA Act of 2009.

President Obama began his term in 2009 by promising his administration was committed “to creating an unprecedented level of openness in Government.”9 Four months later, Obama called for a revision of Executive Order 12958, a 1995 document outlining the system for classifying national security information. The memorandum focused on increasing access to
government information through reducing over-classification, implementing declassification reviews, and prohibiting reclassification of released materials.\(^\text{10}\)

Following the passage of the OPEN Government Act, NARA created the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) in 2009, a self-proclaimed “FOIA ombudsman” responsible for reviewing FOIA policies, procedures and compliance of Federal agencies, and recommending changes based on its observations (ogis.archives.gov). NARA also revised their regulations governing FOIA access to NARA records in fall 2014 to remain compliant with the OPEN Government Act.\(^\text{11}\)

From the frequency of new legislation and executive documents regarding the freedom of information in the United States, it appears the federal government prioritizes public access to information. However, there are still great strides to be taken to truly make unclassified and declassified documents publicly accessible.

**Classified Information: FOIA and Its Limitations**

From a cursory review of FOIA, it may appear US citizens have the right to request access to all records produced by the federal government. However, FOIA only applies to executive branch records and does not apply to elected officials within the government, including the president, senators, and presidential advisors. Additionally, the president can claim executive privilege to withhold requested information in presidential documents.\(^\text{12}\) Furthermore, there are nine categories of government information that are exempt from disclosure under FOIA.

The nine exempt classifications under FOIA include the interest of national defense or foreign policy; internal agency personnel policies; material specifically exempted by another statute; trade secrets; inter- or intra-agency communications unavailable except in the case of litigation; private personnel and medical files; certain law enforcement records, mostly materials that would affect fair trial and/or personal privacy; records regulating financial institutions; and geological and geophysical information.\(^\text{13}\) Section 1.4 of Executive Order 13526 provides further detail on classification categories, including specific topics such as military weapons systems, intelligence sources and programs for safeguarding nuclear materials.\(^\text{14}\) Information seekers who request information that has been designated as classified may receive documents with heavy redactions to delete the exempted portions.

Obama’s 2009 memorandum on classified information also addressed the review of “controlled unclassified information”—information that does not meet the standards for national security classification, yet still requires some level of protection due to its sensitive nature.\(^\text{15}\) In May 2015, the Information Security Oversight Office (ISOO), part of NARA, proposed a rule to implement a Controlled Unclassified Information (CUI) program to standardize practices for designating, disseminating and disposing of CUI materials across the federal government.\(^\text{16}\) This proposal supports ISOO’s purpose of developing and evaluating “security classification policies for classifying, declassifying and safeguarding national security information” (www.archives.gov/ iso).

Another major limitation of FOIA is that it does not apply to many congressional records, as Congress is not part of the executive branch. The Congressional Research Service (CRS) claims: “CRS is unique because its time and efforts are devoted to working exclusively for Congress. Only Members and their staffs can place requests and attend most seminars. While some CRS research and reports may reach the American public, dissemination is at the discretion of congressional clients.”\(^\text{17}\) Many released CRS reports, however, can be found freely online through several “watchdog organizations.”

Documents produced by the executive branch that are not considered “public papers,” such as daily presidential briefings and agency memos, do not follow a standardized path into the public domain. Documents released as public information are not indexed in a single location, which can cause difficulties for researchers.\(^\text{18}\) Further limitations can also exist at the non-federal level, as FOIA does not apply to state or local governments; rather, each state develops their own legislation regarding the freedom of information.

**Declassification**

The federal government is supposed to declassify documents when they cease to meet the standards of classification, as outlined in Section 3.1 of Executive Order 13526.\(^\text{19}\) When information meets classification standards but public interest outweighs the need to protect the information, the priority is on declassification. Often, time limits are assigned to classified information, and such information is not reviewed for declassification until the provided time period has elapsed. Other material perceived as sensitive by the federal government can remain classified for extended periods of time. For example, correspondence between the U.S. government and foreign officials is often not declassified for thirty years or more.\(^\text{20}\)

Additionally, the National Security Agency (NSA) regularly reviews “permanently classified documents” that are 25 years or older for possible declassification, in accordance with the Mandatory Declassification Review provisions of Executive Order 13526.\(^\text{21}\) The order also prohibits new information from being classified indefinitely.\(^\text{22}\) This is beneficial for information
seekers, as it ensures documents are not labeled as permanently classified and never reviewed again, despite potential situation changes.

NARA and ISOO provide many useful online resources for learning more about the process of declassification, including links to relevant documents regulating classified information and a blog devoted to the National Declassification Center (NDC), which solicits input from the public on which documents the NDC should prioritize for declassification review (blogs.archives.gov/ndc). The NDC, established by Executive Order 13526 and housed at the National Archives, intends to shorten the declassification timeline by evaluating and streamlining the current process, prioritizing the declassification of sought-after records, and implementing standard declassification training (tinyurl.com/pscnbfv).

**Dissemination of Information**

After federal government information has been declassified, it is theoretically available for public use. Despite classification changes, many information seekers must actively pursue their desired information, as it is not always readily available through a centralized, official source. Although FOIA allows information seekers to request declassified information from the federal government, users can explore other resources before resorting to filing an official request.

Perhaps the easiest and quickest place to obtain public information without filing a FOIA request is the Federal Register because it is published daily and freely available online (www.federalregister.gov). Users searching for information from a particular government agency should also visit the agency’s online reading room, which contains information not required to be included in the Federal Register, to see if the information is already available.23 Agencies often post documents that have been previously requested to avoid the necessity of future, duplicate requests.

The National Security Agency also offers a helpful service for researchers in its list of “Special Topical Reviews” provided on the agency website (tinyurl.com/nqazfyh). This list includes topics the NSA has determined are of “general public interest.” The agency reviews documents within these topics and posts them to the web page, in accordance with the Open Government Initiative. If a user is searching for information on a popular topic such as the “Cuban Missile Crisis” or “JFK assassination,” he or she may consider checking the NSA website first to see if the documents have already been publicly shared.

If a user is interested specifically in government spending, the federal government offers several “easy-to-understand” websites to help make federal spending information more accessible and empower the public, according to the Open Government Initiative (tinyurl.com/yh9mby7). Such websites include foreignassistance.gov, recovery.gov and USASpending.gov.

Outside these official government sources, there are several academic, nonprofit or other special interest groups that serve as “watchdog organizations” to promote public access to government information by collecting and disseminating declassified documents. The Federation of American Scientists (FAS), for example, hosts a project on government secrecy, which “works to reduce the scope of official secrecy and to promote public access to national security information by seeking reform of national security classification and declassification policies” (fas.org/issues/government-secrecy). Part of this project includes publishing declassified documents online, typically regarding public policy and intelligence policy. One particularly helpful resource offered by FAS is a portal to available CRS reports (fas.org/gov/crs/index.html). Stanford University also publishes archived copies of CRS reports for public access through its Archive-It collection (tinyurl.com/owc44lt), and the University of North Texas offers a similar digital collection (tinyurl.com/bwjysyku).

Another useful public resource is the Digital National Security Archive (DNSA) from The George Washington University, which claims to be “the most comprehensive set of
declassified government documents available” and has been created through the extensive use of FOIA (tinyurl.com/l6tkey). If a user is searching for military or foreign policy documents dating back to 1945, this database can provide those documents without the researcher needing to submit his or her own FOIA request. Interested parties should note the archive has been transitioning to the ProQuest platform since May 2015 (go.proquest.com/dnsa).

The Declassified Documents Reference System (DDRS) is another useful database that contains full-text access to previously classified government documents dating back to 1950 (tinyurl.com/qdcduww). However, like DNSA, this database is not freely available; users must access the database from a subscribing library or academic institution, which adds another barrier to public access. A free alternative to these independent resources is the Federal Depository Library Program (FDLP), which offers public access to federal collections through partnerships with the US Government Publishing Office (tinyurl.com/o8evgg4).

Several of the aforementioned sites, including Archive-It and DNSA, are directly linked from the website of the FOIA ombudsman itself. OGIS has a page dedicated to non-governmental resources that FOIA requesters may find helpful in locating information (tinyurl.com/osbe728). The Department of State also offers a collection of CRS reports, which can be browsed by date, topic, or region (fpc.state.gov/c18185.htm).

If these avenues do not produce the desired information, information seekers generally must submit a written FOIA request to the appropriate agency contact. A list of all federal agencies and their FOIA contacts is available online (tinyurl.com/dy3vou4).

**Access under FOIA and Compliance Statistics**

Even when information is eligible to be released under FOIA and a complete, correct request is submitted, these requests are not always processed immediately. FOIA grants agencies up to twenty working days to fulfill requests, though expedited reviews are available for situations of “imminent threat to life or safety” or an urgent need for a reporter to inform the public about government activity.24 Contrarily, agencies have the option to extend the deadline another 10 days when special conditions exist.

However, not all agencies abide by these deadlines. Agencies such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Homeland Security have an average wait time of one year to process FOIA requests, and many requests wait longer.25 FOIA requires each executive agency to submit reports containing information on fulfilled, denied and backlogged requests to the Attorney General each year.26 These reports and data are available on FOIA.gov, which is run by the Department of Justice (www.foia.gov/reports.html). As illustrated in figure 2, the Department of Justice often takes longer than a year to process a “simple” FOIA request. In such cases, users must remain in active contact with the agency to ensure it is still processing their request.27

![Processing Time for Simple FOIA Request](image-url)

Figure 2. During fiscal year 2014, the DOJ processed most “simple requests” within the required 20 days, but 109 simple requests took more than 400 days to process. URL: www.foia.gov/data.html.
It is also important to note FOIA requests are not necessarily free. Fees for individual agencies can be found on their websites, usually in the electronic reading rooms. These fees often cover time and material costs for the staff locating the materials. Written requests should include a maximum price the user is willing to pay for their materials.\textsuperscript{28} If the fee poses an access issue to a user, he or she may apply for a fee waiver if the material is “in the public interest.”\textsuperscript{29} Fees can also be appealed through FOIA’s appeals process.

Conclusion

Although the federal government has arguably made strides during the past decade to expand public access to information, classification decisions, and the dissemination of declassified information are not perfect. The government itself promotes transparency, participation and collaboration as the “cornerstone of an open government,” yet there are improvements to be made in these three areas.\textsuperscript{30}

Although FOIA is a commendable piece of legislation, the public should not have to actively request information that should already be freely available to them. If information anticipated to be sought after by the public is not classified, it should immediately be made available online, with or without a specific FOIA request. The Open Government Directive espouses this viewpoint, noting: “Agencies should proactively use modern technology to disseminate useful information, rather than waiting for specific requests under FOIA.”\textsuperscript{31} A higher priority needs to be placed on this method until the backlog of unpublished information is cleared, perhaps by hiring temporary staff or outsourcing publication duties to another agency or independent body.

This method could also prove beneficial from an economic perspective. Although sharing more information may seem to be an increased cost to the government, if material were consistently published digitally at the time of declassification, agencies would not need to later dedicate staff time and resources for each FOIA request received. This steady and consistent publication of declassified information would also reduce the long wait times and backlog of FOIA requests.

Furthermore, declassified material should be posted in a format that allows advanced search functions and browsing by important access points such as date created, date released, and topic. The Special Topical Reviews website maintained by the National Security Agency serves as an effective model for future sharing of declassified information. It is also vitally important that Congress fund online permanent access to federal collections through the Federal Depository Library Program, which could serve as a valuable resource in this proposed process by curating recently released documents from each agency’s website to establish a central index for unclassified and declassified government information. This material could then be stored digitally for future access, helping provide permanent public access to declassified information.

Megan Stroup Tristao (meganst@uw.edu) is an MLIS Candidate at the University of Washington Information School.
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With Appropriate Ceremonies, Activities, and Programs

The Creation of Holidays by the US Federal Government

Corina Bardoff

When I am the president, I will make National Robot Day, because robots are awesome. I will declare my birthday Unicorn Day. I will make a National Ice Cream Day when everyone will eat ice cream all day (see below) and a National Pizza Day and there will be two Christmases every year. Unfortunately for our childhood dreams, the creation of holidays is not so simple. This essay will explain the process by which the president and Congress create holidays, define the different types of holidays created by the federal government, and explore briefly the legislative history of several holidays. A calendar is included of the holiday proclamations made by President Obama during his first year in office.

There are 11 permanent federal holidays: New Year’s Day, Inauguration Day (every four years, observed in D.C. only), the Birthday of Martin Luther King Jr., Washington’s Birthday, Memorial Day, Independence Day, Labor Day, Columbus Day, Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, and Christmas Day.1 Federal holidays are created by Congress and signed into law by the president. Many Americans consider these “national holidays” but federal holidays apply only to employees of the federal government and the District of Columbia. In fact, neither the president nor Congress has the authority to declare a “national” holiday2 because there is no such thing. States establish their own legal holidays. In addition to federal holidays, on which federal offices are closed and federal employees have paid time off, each year the president creates or reaffirms celebrations and observances by presidential proclamation.3 Congress can, through statutory language, request that the president issue a proclamation on a yearly basis to commemorate an event. One example of this is National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.4 Presidents may also issue proclamations with no prompt from Congress.

Congress has, throughout its history, used “commemoratives” to honor individuals, groups, and events. At first these were medals, but in the 19th century Congress expanded its commemorative options, “recommending special days for national observance; funding monuments and memorials; creating federal holidays; authorizing the minting of commemorative coins; and establishing commissions to celebrate important anniversaries.”5 By the 20th century, lawmakers were weary of all the commemorating; the House of Representatives in the 104th Congress (1995–1996) adopted a rule that prohibits the House from introducing a bill, amendment, or resolution that “establishes or expresses any commemoration.”6 The Senate has no such rule.

The House rule against commemoratives was ignored in 2001 when Representative Vito Fossella introduced a joint resolution to make September 11th Patriot Day. The bill had 22 co-sponsors and was introduced on October 25, 2001. Speeches were made, and Representative Owens from Brooklyn read a “rap poem” entitled “Towers of Flowers.”7 I will not burden you with it here. At 1:03 p.m. on October 25, the House voted, and the bill passed 407 to zero; 25 representatives were not present.8 The Senate passed SJ.RES29 on November 30, and sent it to be signed by the president on December 3. President George W. Bush signed it, and it became Public Law 107-89 on December 18.9 On September 2, 2002, in advance of the first observance of Patriot Day, President Bush issued a proclamation.10 In this proclamation, he stated, “Those whom we lost last September 11 will forever hold a cherished place in our hearts and in the history of our Nation. As we mark the first anniversary of that tragic day, we remember their sacrifice; and we commit ourselves to honoring their memory by pursuing peace and justice in the world and security at home.”11

Back to the ice cream holiday of our childhood dreams: National Ice Cream Day is real—or was real. National Ice Cream Day occurred on July 15, 1984 and National Ice Cream
Month was the entire month of July 1984. President Ronald Reagan proclaimed, “Ice cream is a nutritious and wholesome food, enjoyed by over ninety percent of the people in the United States. It enjoys a reputation as the perfect dessert and snack food” and called upon “the people of the United States to observe these events with appropriate ceremonies and activities.” National Ice Cream Day and Month came to be through a law passed by Congress: “A joint resolution to proclaim the month of July 1984 as ‘National Ice Cream Month’ and July 15, 1984, as ‘National Ice Cream Day,’” sponsored by Senator Walter (Dee) Huddleson of Kentucky with 62 co-sponsors. President Reagan issued his ice cream proclamation on July 9, 1984. On that same day, he proclaimed African Refugees Relief Day.

In his first year in office, President Obama issued 116 proclamations that established or reaffirm holidays, beginning with a proclamation on his own inauguration day: January 20, 2009. Dear Reader, I had intended to create a calendar to compare Obama, Bush, and Clinton, but I did not anticipate the sheer tonnage of holidays and solemn observances we would be dealing with. I therefore present to you, a calendar of Obama’s 116 holiday proclamations of 2009. After each holiday, I have included a representative quotation from the proclamation or an answer to the question, “How shall we observe this holiday, Mr. President?” If reference is made to legislation establishing the holiday and requiring the president to issue a proclamation, I have included the citation. Presidents also sometimes issue statements on holidays, such as Obama’s Statement on the Observance of Kwanzaa or Remarks on the Observance of Ramadan. These have not been included.

January 20, 2009: National Day of Renewal and Reconciliation
“I call upon all of our citizens to serve one another and the common purpose of remaking this Nation for our new century.”

February 2009: American Heart Month
77 Stat 843; 36 U.S.C. 101
“I invite all Americans to participate in National Wear Red Day on February 6, 2009.”

February 2009: National African American History Month
“I call upon public officials, educators, librarians, and all the people of the United States to observe this month with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs that raise awareness and appreciation of African American history.”

March 2009: American Red Cross Month
“I encourage all Americans to support this organization’s noble humanitarian mission.”

President Roosevelt proclaimed March 1943 as the first Red Cross Month.

March 2009: Irish-American Heritage Month
“With appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.”

March 2009: Women’s History Month
“This year, in accordance with the theme, “Women Taking the Lead to Save our Planet,” we pay particular tribute to the efforts of women in preserving and protecting the environment for present and future generations.”

March 1–7, 2009: Save Your Vision Week
77 Stat 629; 36 U.S.C. 138
“I invite eye care professionals, teachers, members of the media, and all organizations dedicated to preserving eyesight to join in activities that will raise awareness of vision diseases and disorders.”

March 1–7, 2009: National Consumer Protection Week
“I call upon Government officials, industry leaders, and advocates across the Nation to provide our citizens with information about consumer rights, and I encourage all Americans to take a proactive role in strengthening our economy.”

March 2, 2009: Read Across America Day
“On Read Across America Day, parents are encouraged to read to their children for at least 30 minutes.”

March 15–21, 2009: National Poison Prevention Week
“IG encourage all Americans to familiarize themselves with this issue and take steps to protect their families.”

March 25, 2009: Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy
“The American people join Hellenes today in commemorating the 188th anniversary of Greece’s independence.”

April 2009: National Donate Life Month
“I call upon health care professionals, volunteers, educators, government agencies, faith-based and community groups, and
private organizations to join forces to increase the number of organ and tissue donors throughout our Nation.”

April 2009: National Child Abuse Prevention Month
“I encourage all citizens to help prevent and respond to child abuse by strengthening families and contributing to all children’s physical, emotional, and developmental needs.”

April 2009: National Cancer Control Month
“I call upon all courageous cancer patients and survivors, health care providers, researchers, advocates, and others involved in this struggle to work together in support of our Nation’s goal to control, and ultimately defeat, this devastating disease.”

April 2009: National Sexual Assault Awareness Month
“I urge all Americans to respond to sexual assault by creating policies at work and school, by engaging in discussions with family and friends, and by making the prevention of sexual assault a priority in their communities.”

April 5, 2009: Education and Sharing Day, U.S.A.
“I call upon all the people of the United States to look to the future with a renewed sense of civic engagement and common purpose.”

April 8, 2009: National D.A.R.E. Day
“Drugs, gangs, and violence threaten our children and communities every day. Today we commemorate Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), a program that has worked to educate children and protect them from these problems.”

April 9, 2009: National Former Prisoner of War Recognition Day
“Today we honor all prisoners of war by recognizing the tremendous sacrifices made and the hardships endured by those who fight for our freedom.”

April 14, 2009: Pan American Day and April 12–18, 2009: Pan American Week
“As we celebrate Pan American Day and Pan American Week, and participate in the Summit of the Americas, the United States recognizes the common challenges and aspirations that unite the region and the boundless promise of our continuing partnership.”

April 18–26, 2009: National Park Week
“I invite all my fellow citizens to join me in commemorating the 2009 theme for National Park Week, “National and Community Service,” and to visit these wonderful spaces, discover all they have to offer, and become active participants in Park conservation.”

April 19–25, 2009: National Volunteer Week
“I call upon all Americans to join ongoing volunteer service efforts, and to create new ones.”

April 22, 2009: Earth Day
“I encourage all citizens to help protect our environment and contribute to a healthy, sustainable world.”

April 26–May 2, 2009: National Crime Victims’ Rights Week
“I call upon all Americans to observe this week by participating in events that raise awareness of victims’ rights and services and by volunteering to serve victims in their time of need.”

April 28, 2009: National Equal Pay Day
“I call upon American men and women, and all employers, to acknowledge the injustice of wage discrimination and to commit themselves to equal pay for equal work.”

May 2009: National Physical Fitness and Sports Month
“To encourage attention to physical fitness, the President’s Council on Physical Fitness and Sports sponsors the National President’s Challenge, a six-week competition to determine America’s most active State.”

May 2009: Asian American and Pacific Islander Heritage Month
“I call upon the people of the United States to learn more about the history of Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and to observe this month with appropriate programs and activities.”

May 2009: Older Americans Month
“We owe older Americans a debt of gratitude and must work to help them age with dignity.”

May 2009: Jewish American Heritage Month
“Jewish American history demonstrates how America’s diversity enriches and strengthens us all.”

May 1, 2009: Law Day
Public Law 87–20
In 1958, President Eisenhower established Law Day as “a day of national dedication to the principles of government under law.”
“I call upon the people of the United States to acknowledge the importance of our Nation’s legal and judicial systems with appropriate ceremonies and activities, and to display the flag of the United States in support of this national observance.”

May 1, 2009: Loyalty Day
Public Law 85–529
“I call upon all the people of the United States to join in support of this national observance and to display the flag of the United States on Loyalty Day.”

May 3–9, 2009: National Charter Schools Week
“I commend our Nation’s successful public charter schools, teachers, and administrators, and I call on States and communities to support public charter schools and the students they serve.”

May 5, 2009: Peace Officers Memorial Day and May 10–16, 2009: Police Week
“The President has been requested to designate May 15 of each year as Peace Officers Memorial Day in honor of all Federal, State, and local officers killed or disabled in the line of duty, and to designate that week as Police Week in recognition of their service given to the United States (36 U.S.C. 136–37).”

“I call upon all Americans to observe these events with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also call on Governors of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, officials of the other territories subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and appropriate officials of all units of government, to direct that the flag be flown at half staff on Peace Officers Memorial Day. I further encourage all Americans to display the flag at half staff from their homes and businesses on that day.”

May 7, 2009: National Day of Prayer
Public Law 100–307
“I call upon Americans to pray in thanksgiving for our freedoms and blessings and to ask for God’s continued guidance, grace, and protection for this land that we love.”

May 8, 2009: Military Spouse Day
“All Americans should express appreciation for military spouses and let them know they are not alone.”

May 10, 2009: Mother’s Day
38 Stat 770
“I urge all Americans to express their love, respect, and gratitude to mothers everywhere”

36 U.S.C. 120
that the President designate the third Friday in May of each year as “National Defense Transportation Day”
36 U.S.C. 133
that the week during which that Friday falls be designated as “National Transportation Week.”

“I call upon all Americans to recognize the importance of our Nation’s transportation infrastructure and to acknowledge the contributions of those who build, operate, and maintain it.”

May 16, 2009: Armed Forces Day
“Proclamation 7562 of May 16, 2002, is hereby superseded.”

“I call upon all Americans to display the flag of the United States at their homes on Armed Forces Day and urge citizens to learn more about military service by attending and participating in the local observances of the day. I also encourage Americans to volunteer at organizations that provide support to our troops.”

May 16–22, 2009: National Safe Boating Week
36 U.S.C. 131
“Unfortunately, accidents can occur as Americans participate in this popular pastime. Many serious incidents are preventable, and during National Safe Boating Week, I ask Americans to learn more about how to enjoy our Nation’s waters safely and responsibly.”

May 17–23, 2009: World Trade Week
“I encourage all Americans to observe this week with events, trade shows, and educational programs that celebrate the benefits of trade to our Nation and the global economy.”

May 17–23, 2009: Small Business Week
“I call upon Government officials, industry leaders, and advocates across the Nation to encourage our citizens to celebrate the achievements of small business owners and encourage the creation of new businesses.”

May 17–23, 2009: Emergency Medical Services Week
“I encourage all Americans to observe this occasion by sharing their support with local EMS workers and taking steps to improve their personal safety and preparedness.”

May 22, 2009: National Maritime Day
“The Congress, by a joint resolution approved May 20, 1933, has designated May 22 of each year as “National Maritime Day”
and has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for its appropriate observance.”

“Americans have long looked to the sea as a source of security and prosperity. Bounded by two oceans and the Gulf of Mexico, and criss-crossed by a myriad of inland waterways, America’s destiny as a maritime nation was a story foretold.”

May 24–30, 2009: National Hurricane Preparedness Week

“During National Hurricane Preparedness Week, I call on all Americans—including private citizens and those working in government, business, and the nonprofit sector—to plan ahead and help secure the safety and property of those who face advancing storms.”

June 2009: Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Pride Month

“I call upon the people of the United States to turn back discrimination and prejudice everywhere it exists.”

June 2009: Great Outdoors Month

“I encourage all in our Nation to enjoy these resources and to help protect them for future generations.”

June 2009: African-American Music Appreciation Month

“I call upon public officials, educators, and all the people of the United States to observe this month with appropriate activities and programs that raise awareness and foster appreciation of music which is composed, arranged, and performed by African Americans.”

June 2009: National Caribbean-American Heritage Month

“I urge all Americans to commemorate this month by learning more about the history and culture of Caribbean Americans.”

June 2009: National Ocean’s Month

“I call upon all Americans to learn more about the oceans and what can be done to conserve them.”

June 14, 2009: Flag Day and June 14–20, 2009: National Flag Week

Flag Day: 63 Stat 492; National Flag Week: 80 Stat 194

“[A] time to honor America, celebrate our heritage in public gatherings and activities, and recite publicly the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America.”

July 9, 2009: National Summer Learning Day

“Even though summer has arrived, student learning needs do not take a vacation. On Summer Learning Day, we highlight the need for more young people to be challenged during their time off from school. We also express support for local programs, communities, and families that help children grow through learning initiatives. Working together, we can help students remain engaged and return to school with lithe and limber minds.”

July 19–25, 2009: Captive Nations Week

73 Stat 212—the third week of July

“Fifty years ago, President Eisenhower issued a call of solidarity to peoples across the world living under communist rule. This first Captive Nations Week Proclamation expressed concern that too many people lacked fundamental freedoms, and it affirmed that the people of the United States stood alongside those who yearned to be free. Since this declaration, more nations have chosen the path of self-determination and respect for basic human rights.”

June 21, 2009: Father’s Day

36 U.S.C. 109

“I direct the appropriate officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on this day. I urge all Americans to express their love, respect, and admiration to their fathers, and I call upon all citizens to observe this day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.”

July 25, 2009: 35th Anniversary of the Legal Services Corporation

“I call upon legal professionals and the people of the United States to honor the contributions of this vital organization.”

July 26, 2009: Anniversary of the Americans With Disabilities Act

“I call on Americans across our country to celebrate the progress we have made in protecting the civil rights of people with disabilities and to recognize the step forward we make with the signing of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.”

a paradigm shift in protecting the human rights of 650 million people with disabilities worldwide. We proudly join the international community in further advancing the rights of people with disabilities.”


“I call upon all Americans to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities that honor and give thanks to our distinguished Korean War veterans. I also ask Federal departments and agencies and interested groups, organizations, and individuals to fly the flag of the United States at half-staff on July 27, 2009, in memory of the Americans who died as a result of their service in Korea.”

August 21, 2009: Fiftieth Anniversary of Hawaii Statehood

“The Aloha Spirit of Hawaii offers hope and opportunity for all Americans. Growing up in Hawaii, I learned from its diversity how different cultures blend together into one population—proud of their personal heritage and made stronger by their shared sense of community.”

August 23–29, 2009: Minority Enterprise Development Week

“Minority Enterprise Development Week is an opportunity to commemorate the tremendous value minority entrepreneurs and their employees bring to our economy and our Nation as a whole. They embody the timeless American values of hard work, integrity, and optimism.”

August 26, 2009: Women’s Equality Day

“On this Women’s Equality Day, we resolve to continue the important work of our Nation’s foremothers and their successors, and turn their vision of a more equal America into our reality.”

August 30–September 5, 2009: National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week

“During National Historically Black Colleges and Universities Week, we recommit ourselves to never resting until equality is real, opportunity is universal, and all citizens can realize their dreams.”

September 2009: National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month

“National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month helps educate women and men about the importance of knowing common signs and symptoms, scheduling routine doctor visits, and continuing robust scientific research.”

September 2009: National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month

“This month, we remember the lives we have lost, and we recommit ourselves to supporting those currently battling against the disease. National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month also highlights the great medical advancements we have made and reminds us there is still much work to be done.”

September 2009: National Wilderness Month

“I call upon all Americans to visit and enjoy our wilderness areas, learn more about our wilderness heritage, and explore what can be done to protect and preserve these precious national treasures.”

September 2009: National Preparedness Month

“I call upon the people of the United States to recognize the importance of preparing for potential emergencies beforehand and to observe this month with appropriate preparedness activities, events, and training to enhance our national resilience.”

September 4–September 6, 2009: National Days of Prayer and Remembrance

“I ask that the people of the United States, each in their own way, honor the victims of September 11, 2001, and their families through prayer, memorial services, the ringing of bells, and evening candlelight remembrance vigils. I invite the people of the world to share in this solemn commemoration.”

September 7, 2009: Labor Day

“This Labor Day, as we honor our workers, and we renew our commitment to uphold the American Dream and the founding promise of our Nation: in America, we can make of our lives what we will, and all things are possible for all people.”

September 7, 2009: Constitution Day and Citizenship Day; September 17–23, 2009: Constitution Week

“In remembrance of the signing of the Constitution and in recognition of the Americans who strive to uphold the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, the Congress, by joint resolution of February 29, 1952 (36 U.S.C. 106), designated September 17 as “Constitution Day and Citizenship Day,” and by joint resolution of August 2, 1956 (36 U.S.C. 108), requested that the President proclaim the week beginning September 17 and ending September 23 of each year as ‘Constitution Week.’”
With Appropriate Ceremonies, Activities, and Programs

“I encourage Federal, State, and local officials, as well as leaders of civic, social, and educational organizations, to conduct ceremonies and programs that celebrate our Constitution and reaffirm our rights and obligations as citizens of our great Nation.”

September 11, 2009: Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance

“By a joint resolution approved December 18, 2001 (Public Law 107–89), the Congress has designated September 11 of each year as Patriot Day, and by Public Law 111–13, approved April 21, 2009, has requested the observance of September 11 as an annually recognized National Day of Service and Remembrance.”

“I call upon all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States to display the flag of the United States at half-staff on Patriot Day and National Day of Service and Remembrance in honor of the individuals who lost their lives as a result of the terrorist attacks against the United States that occurred on September 11, 2001. I invite the Governors of the United States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and interested organizations and individuals to join in this observance. I call upon the people of the United States to participate in community service in honor of those our Nation lost, to observe this day with other ceremonies and activities, including Remembrance services, and to observe a moment of silence beginning at 8:46 a.m. eastern daylight time to honor the innocent victims who perished as a result of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.”

September 13–September 19, 2009: National Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve Week

“I encourage all Americans to join me in expressing our heartfelt thanks to the members of the National Guard and Reserve and their civilian employers. I also call on State and local officials, private organizations, and all military commanders, to observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”

September 15, 2009: Fifteenth Anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act

“I call upon men and women of all ages, communities, organizations, and all levels of government, to work in collaboration to end violence against women.”

September 15–October 15, 2009: National Hispanic Heritage Month

Public Law 100–402

“The Hispanic community’s values—love of family, a deep and abiding faith, and a strong work ethic—are America’s values.”

September 18, 2009: National POW/MIA Recognition Day

 “[T]he stark black and white banner symbolizing America’s Missing in Action and Prisoners of War will be flown over the White House, the Capitol, the Departments of State, Defense, and Veterans Affairs, the Selective Service System Headquarters, the World War II Memorial, the Korean War Veterans Memorial, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, United States post offices, national cemeteries, and other locations across our country.”

September 20–26, 2009: National Farm Safety and Health Week

“I call upon the people of the United States to join me in celebrating the vital contributions of farmers and ranchers to our Nation and in reflecting upon the importance of farm safety and health in communities across America.”

September 26, 2009: National Hunting and Fishing Day

“Since our Nation’s founding, hunters and anglers have cherished these unparalleled natural gifts and marveled at their untamed beauty. National Hunting and Fishing Day recognizes the contributions of millions of Americans who continue to engage in these ageless pursuits.”

September 26, 2009: National Public Lands Management Recognition Day

“I invite all my fellow citizens to join me in a day of service for our public lands.”

September 27, 2009: Gold Star Mother’s and Families’ Day

“The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 115 of June 23, 1936 (49 Stat. 1895 as amended), has designated the last Sunday in September as ‘Gold Star Mother’s Day.’

“As our Nation remembers our fallen men and women in uniform, we also recognize the profound loss and sorrow of the family members they leave behind.”

September 28, 2009: Family Day

“On Family Day, we honor the dedication of parents, commend the achievements of their children, and celebrate the contributions our Nation’s families have made to combat substance abuse among young people.”

October 2009: National Breast Cancer Awareness Month

“I encourage citizens, Government agencies, private businesses, nonprofit organizations, and other interested groups to join in
activities that will help Americans understand what they can do to prevent and control breast cancer.”

**October 2009: National Disability Employment Month**

“I call on all Americans to celebrate the contributions of individuals with disabilities to our workplaces and communities, and to promote the employment of individuals with disabilities to create a better, more inclusive America, one in which every person is rightly recognized for his or her abilities and accomplishments.”

**October 2009: National Domestic Violence Awareness Month**

“I ask all Americans to do their part to end domestic violence in this country by supporting their communities’ efforts to assist victims in finding the help and healing they need.”

**October 2009: National Cybersecurity Awareness Month**

“I call upon the people of the United States to recognize the importance of cybersecurity and to observe this month with appropriate activities, events, and trainings to enhance our national security and resilience.”

**October 2009: National Information Literacy Awareness Month**

“I call upon the people of the United States to recognize the important role information plays in our daily lives, and appreciate the need for a greater understanding of its impact.”

**October 2009: National Arts and Humanities Month**

“This month, we honor this artistic spirit that lives and breathes within every American.”

**October 2009: National Energy Awareness Month**

“I call upon the people of the United States to mark this month by making clean energy choices that can both rebuild our economy and make it more sustainable.”

**October 4–10, 2009: Fire Prevention Week**

Public Law 109-51

“This week’s theme, “Stay Fire Smart! Don’t Get Burned,” focuses on increasing burn awareness and prevention.”

**October 5, 2009: Child Health Day**

“I call upon families, child health professionals, faith-based and community organizations, and governments to help ensure that America’s children stay safe and healthy.”

**October 6, 2009: German-American Day**

“Germany and its people have also been active participants in our Nation’s history. This year, we celebrate the 60th anniversary of the Federal Republic of Germany, and the 20th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall.”

**October 9, 2009: Leif Erikson Day**

Public Law 88–566

“Over a millennium ago, Leif Erikson—son of Iceland and grandson of Norway—arrived in North America and founded the settlement Vinland, located in modern-day Canada. Today, we celebrate his historic voyage and remember those who journeyed to America from far-away lands.”

**October 11, 2009: General Pulaski Memorial Day**

“Today, as we remember General Pulaski, we celebrate our strong friendship with Poland, and honor those Americans of Polish heritage.”

**October 11–17, 2009: National School Lunch Week**

The week beginning the second Sunday in October: Public Law 87–780

“I call upon all Americans to join the dedicated individuals who administer the National School Lunch Program in appropriate activities that support the health and well-being of our Nation’s children.”

**October 12, 2009: Columbus Day**

“In commemoration of Christopher Columbus’ historic exploration 517 years ago, the Congress, by joint resolution of April 30, 1934 (48 Stat. 657), and an Act of June 28, 1968 (82 Stat. 250), has requested that the President proclaim the second Monday of October of each year as ‘Columbus Day.’”

“I call upon all the people of the United States to observe this day with appropriate ceremonies and activities. I also direct that the flag of the United States be displayed on all public buildings on the appointed day in honor of Christopher Columbus.”

**October 15, 2009: White Cane Safety Day**

“In the 45 years since White Cane Safety Day was first proclaimed by President Lyndon Johnson, Americans who are blind or have low vision have achieved substantial progress.”
October 18–24, 2009: National Character Counts Week

“Instilling sound character and a sense of responsibility in our children is critical to our country’s future.”

October 24, 2009: United Nations Day

“The member states of the U.N. have an obligation to demonstrate the will and leadership to match the aspirations of all. Now is the time for all of us to assume our share of responsibility to meet global challenges.”

October 25–31, 2009: National Forestry Products Week

“To recognize the importance of products from our forests, the Congress, by Public Law 86–753 (36 U.S.C. 123), as amended, has designated the week beginning on the third Sunday in October of each year as National Forest Products Week and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.”

“I call on all Americans to celebrate the varied uses and products of our forested lands, as well as the people who carry on the tradition of careful stewardship of these precious natural resources for generations to come.”

November 2009: Military Family Month

“I call on all Americans to honor military families through private actions and public service for the tremendous contributions they make in the support of our service members and our Nation.”

November 2009: National Adoption Month

“I call upon all Americans to observe this month by reaching out to support and honor adoptive families, as well as to participate actively in efforts to find permanent homes for waiting children.”

November 2009: National Alzheimer’s Disease Awareness Month

“Embryonic stem cells may hold the key for us to better understand, and possibly cure, some of our most devastating diseases and conditions. That is why I signed an Executive Order lifting the ban on Federal funding for embryonic stem cell research, with proper guidelines and strict oversight to prohibit abuse.”

November 2009: National Diabetes Awareness Month

“I encourage citizens, medical institutions, Government and social service agencies, businesses, non-profit organizations, and other interested groups to join in activities that help prevent, treat, and manage diabetes.”

November 2009: National Family Caregivers Month

“I encourage all Americans to pay tribute and support those who are caring for their family members, friends, and neighbors in need of assistance.”

November 2009: National Native American Heritage Month

“As we seek to build on and strengthen our nation-to-nation relationship, my Administration is committed to ensuring tribal communities have a meaningful voice in our national policy debates as we confront the challenges facing all Americans. We will continue this constructive dialogue at the White House Tribal Nations Conference held in Washington, DC, this month. Native American voices have echoed through the mountains, valleys, and plains of our country for thousands of years, and it is now our time to listen.”

“I call upon all Americans to commemorate this month with appropriate programs and activities, and to celebrate November 27, 2009, as Native American Heritage Day.”

November 9, 2009: World Freedom Day

“On World Freedom Day, we celebrate the thriving democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, and we honor their citizens’ right to choose their own destinies and contribute to their nations’ future success.”

November 11, 2009: Veterans Day

“I encourage all Americans to recognize the valor and sacrifice of our veterans through appropriate public ceremonies and private prayers. I call upon Federal, State, and local officials to display the flag of the United States and to participate in patriotic activities in their communities. I call on all Americans, including civic and fraternal organizations, places of worship, schools, and communities to support this day with commemorative expressions and programs.”

November 15, 2009: America Recycles Day

“By recommitting ourselves to recycling, we have the opportunity to secure our long-term success and ensure a bright future for the next generation of Americans.”

November 16–22, 2009: National Entrepreneurship Week

“To strengthen our position in the 21st century, we must recommit ourselves to harnessing the creative spirit that has made America great.”
November 20–26, 2009: National Farm-City Week
“I . . . hereby proclaim the week ending on Thanksgiving Day of each year as National Farm-City Week. I call on Americans as they gather with their families and friends to reflect on the accomplishments of all who dedicate their lives to promoting our Nation’s agricultural abundance and environmental stewardship.”

November 22–28, 2009: National Family Week
“American families are the foundation on which our Nation is built.”

November 22, 2009: National Child’s Day
“Today, we recommit ourselves to the vision of our founders to give all our children a fair chance and an equal start in life.”

November 26, 2009: Thanksgiving Day
“I encourage all the people of the United States to come together, whether in our homes, places of worship, community centers, or any place where family, friends and neighbors may gather, with gratitude for all we have received in the past year; to express appreciation to those whose lives enrich our own; and to share our bounty with others.”

December 2009: Critical Infrastructure Protection Month
“I call upon the people of the United States to recognize the importance of partnering to protect our Nation’s resources and to observe this month with appropriate events and training to enhance our national security and resilience.”

December 2009: National Impaired Driving Prevention Month
“My Administration is working hard to prevent impaired driving. The Department of Transportation’s National Highway Traffic Safety Administration is again sponsoring the campaign known as “Drunk Driving. Over the Limit. Under Arrest.” This effort involves thousands of law enforcement agencies across America. Police will expand their efforts during the high-risk travel period between December 16, 2009, and January 3, 2010 to ensure that impaired drivers are stopped and arrested.”

December 1, 2009: World AIDS Day
“I urge the Governors of the States and the territories subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, and the American people to join in appropriate activities to remember those who have lost their lives to AIDS, and to provide support and comfort to those living with this disease.”

December 3, 2009: International Day of Persons With Disabilities
“The International Day of Persons with Disabilities is a time to renew our commitment to the principles of empowerment, dignity, and equality. The United States has co-sponsored and joined consensus on the United Nations General Assembly Third Committee’s resolution titled, “Realizing the Millennium Development Goals for Persons with Disabilities.” We must continue to embrace diversity and reject discrimination in all its forms, and insist on equality of opportunity and accessibility for all.”

December 7, 2009: National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day
“The Congress, by Public Law 103–308, as amended, has designated December 7 of each year as ‘National Pearl Harbor Remembrance Day.’”

“As Americans, we must keep striving to live up to our founding ideals. As a Nation, the United States will always side with the innocent whose rights are denied, the oppressed who yearn for equality, and all those around the world who strive for freedom.”

December 16, 2009: 65th Anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge
“On this anniversary, we reflect on the enduring commitment of our Armed Forces in defending our liberty, as inspiring today as it was in 1944. The discipline and courage displayed in the Battle of the Bulge continues in Iraq, Afghanistan, and wherever our men and women in uniform are serving. They represent the best of our Nation and we are eternally grateful for their service and sacrifice.”

December 17, 2009: Wright Brothers Day
“The Congress, by a joint resolution approved December 17, 1963, as amended (77 Stat. 402; 36 U.S.C. 143), has designated December 17 of each year as “Wright Brothers Day” and has authorized and requested the President to issue annually a
proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe that day with appropriate ceremonies and activities.”

“In these challenging times, the story of Orville and Wilbur Wright reminds us of what can be accomplished when imagination is joined with tenacity. Their spirit lives on in every garage and basement workshop where American innovators still tinker, invent, and discover.”

Conclusion
These holidays show us what the United States wants to be, how we see ourselves, how our politicians wish we were: we are patriotic and self-sacrificing. We make healthy food choices, volunteer in our national parks, have complex passwords, and always remember the contributions to our society by Polish-Americans, African-Americans, Jewish-Americans, German-Americans, and Asian-Americans. We know that Character Counts, and we are regularly screened for the cancers associated with our gender. Holidays also show us the power of lobbies, hence National Forest Products Week, hence National Ice Cream Month. Above all, we are aware.

Logical and fun extensions follow from this initial project. Next, I would like to gather the proclamations of the rest of Obama’s presidency (so far) and the proclamations of George W. Bush and Bill Clinton (these are easily found on FDsys), tagging the holidays by topic and type, to see what kinds of holidays are most proclaimed. A similar analysis could be done to proposed legislation in Congress. As suggested by the title of this paper, I am especially interested in the part of the proclamation that instructs Americans on how to celebrate or observe the holiday: when should librarians become involved and what should they do? When should flags be displayed and when should they displayed at half-mast? How are we to prepare for the future? What are we called to do?

Corina Bardoff (corina.bardoff@gmail.com), Pratt Institute SILS.
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Money is changing the way political campaigns are run. In the 2008 election, then-senator Barack Obama overcame his short political resume and limited name recognition to best two well-known politicians, Hillary Clinton and John McCain, on his way to the White House. On the way, he became the first major presidential nominee to decline public funds (totaling 84.1 million dollars) for campaign operations since the public funds program for presidential campaigns started in 1976, and instead was able to raise over $700 million dollars from private donors. The idea of public financing for US presidential elections was born in President Theodore Roosevelt’s 1907 State of the Union Address to Congress, when he remarked, “It is well to provide that corporations shall not contribute to Presidential or National campaigns, and furthermore to provide for the publication of both contributions and expenditures.” Roosevelt went on to say that the need for “large campaign funds would vanish” if public money was appropriated for the campaigns of the major political parties. Seven decades later his idea became a reality when the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 was amended to allow for public financing of presidential campaigns. This amendment helped shape presidential elections for years to come, but public financing of elections has been on the way out in just the last decade as new legislation and court decisions have paved the way for private donors and corporations to write bigger checks to candidates and political action committees (PACs).

In the 2004 election, one presidential election cycle before Obama declined public funds for the general election, both presidential nominees from the major parties and a majority of candidates in the presidential primaries had taken public funds (see figure 1). By 2012, no candidate from either major political party accepted public funds for the primary or general elections (see figure 2). The political landscape shifted fast.

What are the implications of these changes on the political process? With this new influx of private money into American political campaigns, how much access to data and information do American citizens have to investigate their leaders and their donors? This paper examines the laws and court decisions that inform our campaign finance system and analyzes the outlets the public has at its disposal to access the information about political donations from individuals, corporations, and nonprofits.

### 2004 Presidential Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Funds Received</th>
<th>Percentage of all funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark For President, Inc. (D)</td>
<td>$7,615,369.19</td>
<td>26.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards for President (D)</td>
<td>$6,706,458.44</td>
<td>23.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gephardt for President (D)</td>
<td>$4,104,319.82</td>
<td>14.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kucinich For President, Inc. (D)</td>
<td>$3,291,062.59</td>
<td>11.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LaRouche in 2004 (D)</td>
<td>$1,456,019.13</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieberman For President (D)</td>
<td>$4,267,796.85</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nader for President 2004 (Populist Party)</td>
<td>$891,568.30</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shapton 2004 (D)</td>
<td>$100,000.00</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Primary Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,433,865.61</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Committee</td>
<td>$14,924,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Committee</td>
<td>$14,924,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Convention Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$29,848,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Bush (R)</td>
<td>$74,620,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Kerry (D)</td>
<td>$74,620,000.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$149,240,000.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Public Funds Distributed in the 2004 Presidential Election

### 2012 Presidential Election

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Funds Certified</th>
<th>Percentage of all funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daddy Roeper for President, Inc (American Elect and the Reform Party)</td>
<td>$151,961.10</td>
<td>25.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary Johnson 2012, Inc. (Libertarian)</td>
<td>$632,016.61</td>
<td>44.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jill Stein for President (Green)</td>
<td>$312,130.44</td>
<td>27.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Primary Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,256,108.34</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention Committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Committee</td>
<td>$11,248,300.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Committee</td>
<td>$11,248,300.00</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Convention Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,496,600.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total General Funds</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22,496,600.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Public Funds Distributed in the 2012 Presidential Election
Is it easy and intuitive for citizens to use government (or other reliable) resources to track these political donations to see how these donations are impacting the political process? Can individuals easily identify not only who is donating to whom, but what interests these donors have at stake? Can individuals easily identify what effect donations had on these interests through Congressional voting records and bills that congressmen and congresswomen introduced during a particular session?

**Background**

On January 21, 2010, The Supreme Court of the United States ruled in their *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission* decision that the government cannot restrict an organization’s independent political expenditures because such expenditures are within an organization’s First Amendment rights. The precedent set by this case has been used to open the floodgates for unlimited political spending by for-profit organizations as well. Ever since this decision, there has been concern about the outsized influence corporate and wealthy donors have on the political system and how elected representatives can remain beholden to all of their constituents in an era where a bulk of campaign finances could come from a few wealthy sources.

Efforts to regulate, reform, and tinker with the United States’ campaign finance system have been going on for decades now, both in Congress and the courts. One of the first landmark pieces of legislation related to campaign finance was the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971. The act was signed into law by President Nixon in order to “promote fair practices in the conduct of election campaigns for Federal political offices.”

One of the enduring legacies of the act was the creation of the Federal Election Commission, which to this day remains the leading independent regulatory agency for campaign finance in the United States.

Over the following years, the Supreme Court weighed in on the FECA numerous times. In 1976, the Court clarified in *Buckley v. Valeo* that the First Amendment protects political expression, including the donation of funds to political campaigns, because this type of speech is instrumental in bringing about the “political and social changes desired by the people.”

The Court did uphold the FECA’s provision limiting the amount a single individual could donate to a campaign.

In 1990, the Court upheld restrictions on corporate political speech in *Austin v. Michigan State Chamber of Commerce*. At stake was the Michigan Campaign Finance Act, which prohibited corporations from using “general treasury funds” for elections. The court determined that even though this restriction burdened the right to free speech, the act was constitutional because of a justifiable state interest in “preventing corruption . . . in the political arena by reducing the threat that huge corporate treasuries . . . will be used to influence unfairly election outcomes.” The debate has remained strikingly similar in recent years; this concern has been at the heart of arguments put forth by campaign finance reform advocates in the wake of the *Citizens United v. FEC* decision.

**Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act**

Congress weighed in on campaign finance again during the early 2000s when they passed the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act (BCRA) of 2002. The BCRA updated campaign finance regulations to better reflect the threats and issues of the Internet Age. The act strengthened oversight of federal elections by reducing special interest influence and adding strong disclosure provisions. Disclosure is one of the most contentious, and arguably most important, aspects of campaign finance reform. Disclosure rules, in campaign finance parlance, refer to whether or not campaigns (for both specific candidates and issues) need to release information about individuals that have donated money to their campaigns. The BCRA set the ground rules requiring Internet access to records, maintenance of a website of election reports, additional disclosure reports, and public access to broadcasting records. The Federal Election Commission was tasked with maintaining an Internet presence that made “accessible to the public all publicly available election-related reports and information” that were already required to be filed under the original FECA.

Supporters of strict disclosure rules argue that the citizens of this country deserve to know who is donating to which candidates and how much they are donating. These supporters argue that by disclosing donors, campaigns are forced to be more transparent and are not as likely to get away with any corruption or quid pro quo political favors. They surmise that more publicly available information about campaign finance will lead to better educated and more aware voters.

On the other hand, there are other political actors who feel that disclosure requirements are a deterrent to a citizen’s right to free political speech guaranteed by the First Amendment. In fact, one of the main goals of the Citizens United group in their 2009 case was to limit the amount of disclosure required by law. They argued that “one of the chief concerns with the Reporting Requirement is the disclosure of donors who may then be subject to various forms of retaliation by political opponents.”

There is precedent for this line of argument; the Court found in the 1976 *Buckley v. Valeo* case that challenges to the disclosure provisions would be heard if there was a “reasonable probability” that political contributors would be subject to “threats, harassment, or reprisals from either Government officials or private...
parties” if their identities were to become known. However, this view becomes problematic if the public wants robust access to campaign finance information because it is unclear how a regulatory body could fairly and consistently determine what would constitute an “reasonable probability” of being at risk to adverse consequences as a result of disclosure.

While the Supreme Court’s ruling in *Citizens United v. FEC* relaxed many campaign finance regulations, it upheld the provisions for robust disclosure requirements (see figure 3). The Roberts Court found that disclosure requirements may be an additional “burden” on the speaker, but also that they are constitutional because they don’t actually bar anyone from speaking or place a maximum limit on speech. Disclosure is justifiable because it provides citizens with information about who is funding campaigns for public office. The Court may have upheld strong disclosure requirements, but as the electorate, how can the American people use disclosed political contributions data to ensure that individual and corporate donations are not giving rise to corruption?

**Findings**

**FEC Resources**

As a result of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act, the Federal Election Commission has been tasked with the responsibility of providing access to campaign finance data for the American public. Their website can be found and explored at www.fec.gov. On the front page of the commission’s website there is a clear and prominent link to the FEC’s Campaign Finance Disclosure Portal. From this portal, the user can choose between five broad categories: Graphic Data Presentations, Searchable Systems, Downloadable Data, Other Campaign Finance Data, and Using FEC Public Records. Arguably the two most informative and useful sections for the purposes of this paper are the “Searchable Systems” and “Downloadable Data” sections.

**Searchable Systems**

The first option under “Searchable Systems” is the “Candidate and Committee Viewer.” This platform allows easy and intuitive searching of a database of political donations. The search engine allows for easy viewing of reports that can be viewed by candidate, political committee, independent expendor, or other campaign finance report flier. Reports for each entity are broken up into two-year periods and show the total receipts and disbursements over that time period from that entity. The data is available to download as an .xml, .cxv, or .json file.

Under the receipts category, the user can click on a link to Itemized Individual Contributions and a list of every individual who donated to that campaign during that election cycle will be returned. Once the data is downloaded, the results can be sorted by the donor’s employer, occupation, city, and amount of donation. There are over three million results that are returned for “Itemized Individual Contributions” to Barack Obama’s 2012 election campaign for president. The sheer size of this data set makes the data difficult to analyze except in the aggregate because no one wants to wade through three million results, but anything a citizen could possibly want to know about who has contributed to what candidates is here on the FEC’s website. One drawback of the data provided here is that each contribution from any individual is listed separately. Therefore, if someone were to have donated multiple times to a candidate (which is a frequent occurrence) in a single election cycle, each donation would show up separately as opposed to showing an aggregate donation amount for each individual (see figure 4).
Follow the Money

The second option under “Searchable Systems” is the “Disclosure Data Catalog.” This catalog includes data files on administrative fines levied on campaigns, reports on contributions bundled by lobbyists, and a list of registered leadership PACs. This is a helpful resource to see which campaigns have been found to not be in compliance with campaign finance laws.

The third option is “Independent Expenditure Search,” which is a database with information on groups that have purchased some type of electioneering communication (i.e., phone calls, television ads, etc.) in support or opposition of a particular candidate. For each expenditure, the database shows the candidate, whether the communication was in support or opposition of the candidate, who was paid to conduct the communication, and the amount that was paid.

The fourth option, “Individual Contribution Search,” is another one of the most powerful tools on the FEC site. The user can type in any individual’s name and see a full list of that person’s donations to candidate and political action committees. The size of the donation, the person’s employer, and the person’s city of residence are all included in the results (see figure 5).

Downloadable Data

The Downloadable Data tab provides access to larger data files on individual contributions, contributions to candidates, and other electioneering communication reports. While many individuals may find such large data sets unusable or difficult to work with, political campaigns and organizations with greater resources can perform complex and sophisticated analysis on the data. Because of the huge data sets and the multiple ways that data can be interpreted (or manipulated) with crafty analysis, the issue becomes trusting the conclusions that these organizations offer. Would the public benefit from an official independent watchdog group that analyzed campaign finance data and made their findings open to the public?

Independent Watchdog Groups

Though the breadth and scope of all this publicly available data is incredibly illuminating and powerful, there is no easy and fluid way through federal agency sites to connect and compare a candidate’s political donors with that candidate’s legislative or voting record. The FEC’s donation data exists largely in a vacuum with little to no independent analysis to provide context. A researcher or concerned citizen would have to separately search a site like congress.gov to find information about a congressperson’s voting or legislative record.

Fortunately, independent watchdog groups that are committed to uncovering or shedding light on any potential quid pro quo corruption in the government have been filling the gap. OpenSecrets.org (an arm of the non-partisan Center for Responsive Politics), for example, uses data available through the FEC to put together reports tying a candidate’s financial contributions from a certain industry with a candidate’s voting
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Figure 4. List of Itemized Individual Contributions to Barack Obama during the 2012 election (Sorted by Name)
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record on issues pertaining to that industry. In 2013 they published an “Issue Profile” on “Gun Control vs. Gun Rights” after a vote in the Senate on the Manchin-Toomey Amendment, which would have required background checks on gun sales. The amendment failed and OpenSecrets’ independent analysis showed that 43 of the 46 senators who opposed the amendment received contributions (totaling over a half million dollars) from gun-rights and gun-manufacturer PACs. Meanwhile, only 11 of the 54 senators who supported the amendment received similar contributions. Money from gun control PACs was also analyzed, but only totaled $5,000.13 This still is not nearly enough evidence to prove that there is any type of quid pro quo corruption occurring in this case as a result of campaign donations, because gun-rights and gun-manufacturer PACs are more likely in general to give financial support to candidates they believe will vote in their favor (whether the candidates receive donations or not). It is, however, a move in the right direction toward more responsive and contextual campaign finance data.

Conclusion

In order to wage a competitive campaign for federal political office in the United States today, a candidate needs to amass a formidable amount of political donations to finance the advertising and operations budget that goes into building their image and communicating their stances on political issues. Concerns have been raised about the level of influence that a political donation could buy when that candidate assumes office and begins voting on issues. In *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Supreme Court reassured the public that “independent expenditures, including those made by corporations, do not give rise to corruption or the appearance of corruption. That speakers may have influence over or access to elected officials does not mean that those officials are corrupt. And the appearance or influence or access will not cause the electorate to lose faith in this democracy.” Based on a recent *New York Times*/CBS News poll, the public appears to disagree. Among the poll’s findings is the startling result that 85 percent of poll respondents thought that once elected, politicians promote policies that “directly help the people and groups who donated money to their campaigns” either “most of the time” or “sometimes.” If the public’s faith in its government is going to be restored, something has to be done about the country’s campaign finance system.

In *Citizens United v. FEC*, the Supreme Court upheld strong disclosure requirements that, hopefully, will give the public the tools and resources to hold their elected representatives accountable. A good faith effort is being made by the Federal Election Commission, independent watchdog groups, and campaigns to report data related to campaign finance. This paper finds that the Federal Election Commission is doing their part to make publicly available all forms of campaign finance data. The issue remains turning this incredible wealth of data into information that is meaningful and enlightening for the general public.

Figure 5. List of Donations Made to Candidates and Committees by Donald Trump
Follow the Money
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Conservation in America
A Look at the National Park Service and the US Fish and Wildlife Service

Kerri Rose

President Theodore Roosevelt is often viewed as the father of conservation; although he was a great champion for wildlife and wilderness, concern for America’s natural resources began about half a century before Roosevelt took office. A mixture of laws, executive orders, and regulations over the last two centuries helped to protect wildlife and their natural habitats. Although a number of agencies, departments, and bureaus deal with the care and conservation of America’s natural resources, two agencies are critical to conservation in America: the National Park Service and US Fish and Wildlife Service.

A Brief History
Early conservation in the United States was done with the intent to manage resources for commercial use rather than to protect wildlife and wilderness areas for their natural beauty and inherent value.1 Westward expansion would play a great role in creating a mindset for conservation by inspiring people to appreciate the beauty of nature. In the mid-nineteenth century, images depicting the west, travel literature and the “nature essay” gained popularity. Fiction that offered an idealistic view of life among the elements gave Americans a romantic notion of nature and helped to shape public opinion on the intrinsic value of the wilderness.2

In 1868, President Ulysses S. Grant established the Pribilof Islands in Alaska as a reserve in order to protect the northern fur seal. Four years later, the Yellowstone National Park would be the first national park, established in order to conserve its hot springs and geysers. Although the provision also provided protection against the destruction of wildlife, establishment as a national park failed to adequately protect wildlife, which lead to the passage of the Yellowstone National Park Protection Act of 1894).3 4

The growing desire to protect the nation’s wilderness areas and wildlife led to the creation of two agencies in the late 19th century: the federal Office of Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries (created in 1871, later re-designated the Bureau of Fisheries and eventually evolving into the Fish and Wildlife Service) and the Division of Economic Ornithology and Mammalogy (created in 1885, and eventually combining into the Fish and Wildlife Service).5 6 Studies by these agencies found that “resources were in jeopardy.”7 Rising public awareness, along with political concern, would prompt government action and the establishment of agencies dedicated to the study and conservation of wildlife and America’s natural resources.

National Park Service
Although Yellowstone National Park was established in 1872, the National Park Service (NPS) did not come into existence until 1916. On May 9, 1916, a bill to establish a national park service was introduced in the House. The bill was comprised of four sections. The first section specified the jobs needed to manage the new NPS along with their salaries. The following two sections explained the powers of the director and the Interior, respectively. The final section clarified that this new Act will not infringe on the previous 1901 Act “relating to rights of way through certain parks, reservations and other public lands.”8

On August 25, 1916, President Woodrow Wilson signed into law the bill creating the NPS. The law provided that the agency would operate under the Department of Interior and would manage 24 national parks along with 21 national monuments, which were a mix of “Indian ruins, geological features” and other important sites reserved under the Antiquities Act of 1906.9

In 1926 the NPS expanded to include the Shenandoah, the Great Smoky Mountains and the Mammoth Cave National Parks. Subsequently, under President Franklin Roosevelt, parks and memorials in Washington, DC, War Department battlefields and forts, and Forest Service national monuments were transferred to the NPS. After World War II, the increased use of automobiles and the public’s desire for recreation rapidly
increased the number of visitors to the park system. In 1980, the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act “more than doubled” the extent of the national park system.10

Currently, Title 16 of the US Code deals with conservation. Section One of Title 16 in the US Code establishes the NPS under the Department of Interior. A director is charged with managing the park system and the natural resources as he or she deems fit. The director is appointed by the president and confirmed by Congress. The ensuing sections and subchapters of Chapter One, Title 16, govern the national park system created over the past two centuries along with policies and laws related to it.11

The national park system in America has grown tremendously since passage of the Organic Act of 1916. Today, the national park system consists of more than 400 sites on over 84 million acres. There are 59 national parks along with over 125 historical sites. The NPS also protects the habitats of over 400 endangered and threatened species. In 1920 the national parks system had a million visitors; by 2014 over 290 million people visited the parks nationwide.12

**US Fish and Wildlife Service**

It is impossible to separate the complicated history of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) from the history of the National Refuge System. Although the FWS did not come into existence until 1940, its roots began much earlier. The agency was born out of two bureaus established in the late 19th century—the Bureau of Fisheries discussed above (previously under the Commerce Department) and the Bureau of Biological Survey (previously under the Agriculture Department).13

Early public concern about the near extinction of certain species of birdlife and with the destruction of wetland regions for urban development led the government to take action to protect wildlife and the habitats. In 1901 the Florida State Legislature passed a game-bird protection law. More importantly, in that year Theodore (Teddy) Roosevelt, a champion for conservation, took office as President. He established the first wildlife refuge in the United States to protect the brown pelican at Pelican Island in 1903.14 In the next six years, numerous refuges were established in Louisiana, Florida, Washington, California, and parts of the Hawaiian Islands. In all, “[b]y the end of his administration in 1909, Roosevelt had issued a total of 51 executive orders that established wildlife reservations in 17 states and three territories.”15

In 1929 Congress passed the Migratory Bird Conservation Act, establishing a refuge system. Major funding for this refuge system would come later, in 1934, with the passage of the Migratory Bird Hunting and Conservation Act, also known as the Duck Stamp Act. Management of the Refuge system was under the Bureau of Biological Survey. The Bureau was transferred to the Department of Interior in 1939 along with the refuge system.16 In 1940 the FWS was established, then later reorganized under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956.17 The Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 redistributed the responsibilities of the FWS between the newly-created Bureau of Commercial Fisheries and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.18 The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries was transferred in 1970 to the Department of Commerce, while the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife (which included the Division of Wildlife Refuges) stayed under the Department of Interior and became the FWS of today.19

The FWS is now governed by the provisions of Title 16 of the US Code. Section 742a of the Title 16 highlights the need for conservation policies regarding America’s fish and wildlife resources, while section 742b of Title 16 establishes the US Fish and Wildlife Service under the Department of Interior.20 The FWS enforces laws protecting wildlife, manages birdlife and fisheries. The agency protects and restores wetlands along with other habitats, and also covers endangered species. Today, the FWS runs more than 550 National Wildlife Refuges totaling 150 million acres along with 70 National Fish Hatcheries. They have formed partnerships with non-governmental organizations and work internationally.21

**Endangered Species**

An area of conservation where the National Park Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service intersect is that of endangered or threatened species. In 1973, the Endangered Species Act was passed, establishing policies and procedures for protecting endangered fish, wildlife and plants.22 The Endangered Species Act is administered by the US Fish and Wildlife Service in coordination with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries (which is under the Department of Commerce). According to NOAA there are approximately 2,215 endangered or threatened species, of which 645 are foreign. NOAA has jurisdiction over 122 marine aquatic species; the FWS manages land and freshwater species.23

In order to protect certain species under the ESA, the species must be added to the “List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife” after meeting certain requirements.24 For species that make the list, recovery plans are developed by the FWS, usually working in coordination with local and state governments and with private organizations. If the endangered species requires a certain habitat to recover, that habitat is considered “critical habitat;” extra effort is put forth to conserve critical habitats.25

The NPS also plays an important role in conservation of endangered species. “At least one or more endangered species
are found in 204 of the 394 National Park Service units.”26 The NPS works with other agencies to prevent more species from becoming endangered. In 11 years between 2002 and 2012, the NPS successfully recovered 38 species.27

**Conclusion**

Since the mid-1800s, the US government has taken efforts to conserve and protect America’s wildlife. The FWS’ Wildlife Refuge system, which began as a few reserves under executive orders, has become a massive system of 150 million acres. The FWS, with its long and complex history, not only manages the refuge system but also plays a vital role in managing endangered species. The NPS, which will turn 100 on August 25, 2016, runs close to 400 national parks, many of which are iconic sites in America. Although conservation is a massive undertaking, with a number of agencies and departments working together, the FWS and the NPS have made their mark on the nation’s history and continue to be crucial organizations when it comes to protecting and conserving America’s fundamental natural beauty.

**Kerri Rose (krose3221@gmail.com), Pratt Institute**
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A common topic in the literature and in coursework for information and library science is digital preservation, both in the sense of digitizing print and other hard copy formats to extend the lifespan of a work and in the sense of collecting digital content such as web documents to ensure continuing access to those resources. Through class discussions on this subject, I developed an interest in systematic efforts to preserve access to born-digital materials (e.g., the Internet Archive and its WayBack Machine). While several of my professors mentioned the widespread use of digital preservation in academic settings, I wonder what efforts are occurring at the government level. In my class readings, I ran across a discussion of the Library of Congress’ National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP) and began investigating this program and its initiatives.¹ This paper seeks to introduce the NDIIPP to other students and to act as a brief update on the program as it celebrates its fifteenth anniversary. This paper opens with a legislative history of the NDIIPP, moves on to a short discussion of the results of selected program initiatives, and concludes with an evaluation of how well NDIIPP’s own website upholds its mission of promoting and maintaining access to information.

A Legislative History of the NDIIPP

The roots of the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP) go back to the 1990s as the rapidly changing and expanding world of digital information raised worries about technological obsolescence and questions about ensuring continued access to digital information in the face of the ephemeral nature of web content. In 1996, Waters and Garrett released the final report for the Task Force on Archiving of Digital Information, which recommended “the development of a national system of digital archives, which it defines as repositories of digital information that are collectively responsible for the long-term accessibility of the nation’s social, economic, cultural and intellectual heritage instantiated in digital form.”² The authors came to this conclusion through the realization that while the primary responsibility for preservation should lie with the creators and owners of digital content, there is also a need for trusted organizations (which they believe should go through a certification process) that have the “right and duty to exercise an aggressive rescue function as a fail-safe mechanism for preserving valuable digital information that is in jeopardy of destruction, neglect or abandonment by its current custodian” along with a strong infrastructure to support migration, storage, and access to these resources for future researchers (interestingly, at this point it was focused not on the public, but researchers).³ Of course, this organizational network would need a strong administrator to guide its activities and oversee the certification process. Given the relatively recent publication of Waters and Garret’s report, it is no surprise that when the Library of Congress asked the National Research Council in 1998 to create an advisory task force for a technology strategic plan, the task force recommended that the Library of Congress assume the supervisory role for a national digital preservation effort, perhaps because of its preexisting digital collections (see figure 1 on next page).⁴

The National Research Council’s findings, known as LC21, also included a number of other recommendations that became a cornerstone of the NDIIPP. For instance, “the Library should aggressively pursue clarification of its right to collect copies of US-based websites under the copyright deposit law . . . LC should seek legislation that changes the copyright law to ensure that it has this right” created the foundations for the Section 108 Study Group named after the applicable section of the Copyright Act.⁵

An Introduction to the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP)

Maureen Fitz-Gerald
The same year as LC21’s publication, 2000, Congress passed the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2001 (Public Law 106-554), which provided the initial funding and charge for the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program. The act appropriated $100 million for the program’s use, $75 million of which was explicitly dedicated to grants and other program expenditures with the provision that the recipients provide matching funds (including in-kind funds) received by March 31, 2003. The funding also stipulated that only $5 million of the $25 million set aside for administrative purposes could be spent until the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate approved a guiding plan developed by the Librarian of Congress with other related entities, including the National Archives and Records Administration, researchers, and businesses involved with digital preservation. Public Law 108-7 (passed in 2003) changed the due date for the provision of matching funds from March 31, 2003, to March 31, 2005, and Public Law 108-447 (from 2004) changed the wording so that pledges of matching funds also allowed the NDIIPP administrators to use the appropriated money as well as extending the deadline further, from 2005 to 2010; this is undoubtedly due to the fact that the initial strategic plan took two years to complete and the initial call for grant proposals was not released until 2003, making the initial deadline for funding impossible to meet.

As their willingness to amend the legislation regarding appropriations for NDIIPP indicates, Congress recognized the importance of NDIIPP’s mission and that the Library of Congress is most suitable for fulfilling these goals. So, while the program may have had a slower start than they expected, support for NDIIPP continued and the eight selected projects had their initial kickoff in January 2005. Each of the projects consists of a lead institution and at least one partner institution, and each has a Library of Congress staff member involved as a liaison. The initial grants provided $500 thousand to $3 million for up to three years, and this longer time line reflects the NDIIPP’s goal of creating sustainable, long-term efforts. In addition to the individual project partnerships, NDIIPP sought to increase national collaboration by having the project members participate in “affinity groups,” cross-project interests including intellectual property rights (the Section 108 Study Group mentioned earlier), content collection and selection, technical infrastructure, and the economics of sustainable digital preservation. Along with the addition in 2006 of a focus on state and local government information, Accompanying the addition of a new affinity group, Public Law 109-55 set $10 million of the $75 million grant funding money aside for state government use and waived the requirement for matching funds from them to encourage cooperation for the collection and preservation of at-risk state and local digital information.

A wealth of information on the growth of the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program comes from the unfortunate reality of the 2008 national recession. At that time, the NDIIPP experienced a rescission as necessity dictated the redirection of $47 million of the previously appropriated funds the administrators had yet to spend and their various partners withdrew a further $37 million in promised matching funds. At the hearing for the next year’s budget they requested $6 million to keep the program alive, and, records show that the NDIIPP received the money they requested with budgets over $7.5 million in 2009 and 2010, after which the annual appropriation levels once again dropped. At the same time, the decreased funding levels do not appear to be a reflection on low regard for NDIIPP within the legislative branch, and, in fact the opposite appears to hold true as the Higher Education Opportunity Act (Public Law 110-315), passed the same year the Librarian of Congress pleaded for funds to keep the program alive and strong, mandated the participation of the NDIIPP’s Copyright Group in the nineteen-member Advisory Commission on Accessible Instructional Materials in Postsecondary Education for Students with Disabilities. The inclusion of NDIIPP in this federal advisory group indicates that Congress sees NDIIPP and its members as experts in issues of digital preservation and accessibility and that the current funding situation has more to do with the economic situation than any correlation to the importance of the program.

Success? Two Case Studies for NDIIPP Initiatives

After fifteen years, the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP) still receives congressional support and contains a multiplicity of programs. In 2009, NDIIPP received an award from Government Computer News for “its success in working with universities and libraries to model distributed preservation practices, working with state consortia to help in the preservation of state government digital information, and working with commercial content providers to develop standards for digital preservation.” The program also receives mentions in scholarly articles published in a variety of fields, including an entire issue of Library Trends dedicated to its initiatives. Plaudits like the journal articles and the GCN Award shows that the NDIIPP contains a number of successful initiatives, but success is not necessarily clear-cut.

One particularly notable initiative is the NDIIPP’s work on copyright, especially in the Section 108 Study Group,
which began as one of the initial inter-project affinity groups in 2005 and produced its final report in 2008. NDIIPP produced several reports on copyright, including one that provides sections of current (circa 2008) copyright laws from the United Kingdom, Australia, the Netherlands, and the United States relevant to digital preservation and access in an easily navigated format. While not necessarily an award, creating a logical publication with practical implications is a form of success in itself. For a more concrete example of recognition for the copyright efforts of NDIIPP, the inclusion of a member of NDIIPP on the federally mandated Advisory Commission on Accessible Instructional Materials in Postsecondary Education for Students with Disabilities demonstrates the expertise of the program. Moreover, the testimony of Laura Gasaway, the co-chair of the Section 108 Study Group, in a congressional hearing as an expert witness, who then referred back to the recommendations of their final report as a way to improve access for students and researchers to digital material while still providing copyright protection for the creators and owners of the content, shows that publications from the NDIIPP do carry weight in a discussion of the issues of digital preservation.

The NDIIPP incorporates numerous government information-focused collections and initiatives (see Figures 2 and 3), but one of the most prominent is the Preserving State Government Initiative, which included four subsidiary programs, and had more mixed results than did the Section 108 Study Group. At the conclusion of the initiative in 2012, the Model Technological and Social Architecture for the Preservation of State Government Digital Information’s (one of the four programs) final report included this statement: “Perhaps the most important lesson we learned in the course of the project was that the time has not yet come to advance a common information architecture and tool set for preserving and providing access to digital legislative content. Few of our partner states had the capacity to invest and participate in even a small prototype project.” And while this particular program did produce the Center for Archival Resources On Legislatures (CAROL), an online resource center for capturing, preserving, and providing access to digital information, they also decided to create a shadow archive because they acknowledged that there were still issues that current technology could not resolve. The Multi-State Demonstration Project for Preservation of State Government Digital Information likewise reported technical and bureaucratic issues that meant the projects had mixed success. For instance, certain states’ metadata for their records were incompatible with the host system so that they were more difficult for users to find. At the same time, the fact that all four programs continued despite the recession and other difficulties is a win for the initiative because one of the major objectives of NDIIPP is to increase long-term national collaborations for digital preservation. Despite some setbacks, the four initiatives successfully increased the confidence and ability of the participants as digital preservationists.

Evaluating Information Access from the NDIIPP

As the focus of the NDIIPP is on collecting, preserving, and maintaining access to digital information through collaborative outreach, looking at the ways and the ease with which users can access information on NDIIPP in many ways reflects the success of the program itself. The main dissemination method for information on the activities of the NDIIPP and its various subsidiaries is on the websites of each initiative, with the main program’s website, digitalpreservation.gov, serving as a web portal. Unfortunately, the Library of Congress’ website (which hosts digitalpreservation.gov) has recently undergone a website update and many pages that once linked into the NDIIPP site are now broken and give either a 404 error or a message explaining the recent page migrations with a request to report the broken links. While this is certainly understandable, the fact that a primary aspect of the NDIIPP’s mission is to provide access to digital information and yet users cannot access information on the program’s site is disappointing. That one of the very first links on the homepage (for the Library of Congress Web Archives) returns this error, not just the links buried deeper within the site, especially causes consternation. Beyond mere philosophical concern, the broken links are also a worry as most of the publications hosted on digitalpreservation.gov are not accessible through FDsys and if a link is broken, as in the case of a conference presentation from 2008 on JHOVE2, users may be unable to access the information elsewhere without a subscription-based service.

The search function on the Library of Congress website can sometimes be frustrating to use as the results include blogs, newsletters, and other such materials and there are limited filters to help researchers retrieve more professional publications. A much easier shortcut for some documents is to use the Catalog of U.S. Government Publications, although it only includes seven results for the NDIIPP. For annual reports on the NDIIPP, they are not issued separately but as part of the annual reports from the Librarian of Congress and the Library’s Office of Strategic Initiatives. Another good way to find information on NDIIPP’s annual activities as a whole program is to look at the Congressional appropriation hearings where NDIIPP has made an annual presentation to Congress (often with supplemental materials) since 2008.
Not all of NDIIPP’s online presence is lackluster and weighing these successes against the difficulties mentioned earlier shows the same sort of mixed results present in the final report of the NDIIPP’s Preserving State Government Initiative. For instance, while the list of publications on digitalpreservation.gov does include the occasional broken link, the chronological arrangement allows easy access to the most recent documents, and the fact that it collects reports from a variety of areas, including professional journals and conference presentations, making them publicly available in one location is laudable. NDIIPP also maintains an active social media presence on Facebook and Twitter (as well as slightly less active accounts on iTunesU and YouTube) in addition to their blog, which provide a great way to keep up-to-date on general activities from the NDIIPP initiatives, like the introduction of the Federal Web Archiving Working Group.23 The individual initiative websites like Americanarchive.org (a searchable database of the digitized collections from the project focused on public broadcasting) may not complete planned updates as quickly as desired, perhaps because of the reduction in funds, yet still manage to perform the needed functions.

**Conclusion**

When the National Digital Information Infrastructure and Preservation Program (NDIIPP) truly began with the announcement of the initial initiatives in 2004, there were thirty-six partners in the program and, at the end of the 2013 fiscal year, there were three hundred and nineteen partners located in twenty-seven countries.24 Perhaps not surprising given its continued growth and the sheer number of initiatives, NDIIPP has also experienced some pitfalls along the way, including in the content hosting on its own website. However, in its fifteen years of existence and its incredible growth, the NDIIPP has accomplished many tasks as it continues to focus on “learning through action.”25 In 2011, the Librarian of Congress reported that NDIIPP provided access to more than fourteen thousand collections and released twenty-five technical tools and services to the public under open licensing, and in 2013 alone, the Digital Preservation Outreach and Education section of NDIIPP provided instruction to over fifteen hundred digital preservationists nationwide.26 As these figures can attest, the NDIIPP still provides an important and effective service in its promotion of national and international collaborations on issues surrounding digital preservation.
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In 1941, a onetime chef returned to his native Vietnam after travels abroad, his mind aflame with communist ideals. Over a tumultuous decade he sparked an unlikely independence movement, rallying loyalists to confound imposing foes such as France, Japan, China and ultimately the United States of America. Ho Chi Minh, referred to as "Uncle Ho" by his committed charges, repeatedly inspired a sense of nationalism to defy the interloping superpowers, besting them with equal parts fervor and craftiness, not to mention a penchant for attrition.

Joint Publications Research Service (JPRS) Reports, 1957-1994 chronicles Ho's profound impact on Vietnam's history, including the country's ultimate independence. The collection contains millions of pages from a wealth of sources, including monographs, reports, serials, journal and newspaper articles, and radio and television broadcasts. Featuring an emphasis on communist and developing nations, it is an ideal tool for researching military, socioeconomic, political, environmental, scientific and technical issues and events.