

MEMORANDUM

FROM: Research Department, Kansas Legislative Council July 10, 1967

TO: Special Joint Committee on Legislative Facilities

RE: Conference with Communications Equipment and Engineering Company

July 10, 1967, 10:00 a.m.

The Conferees were Roy E. Myers, Treasurer, and W. H. Callison, Engineer, Communication Equipment and Engineering Company; William Hale, State Architect, and John Webb and Frank Applegate, architectural services division; Edna Young, Chief Journal Clerk, House of Representatives; John Weeks, Revisor of Statutes; Harold Gibbon, Acting Controller; and Richard Ryan, Research Department.

New Equipment Proposed

Mr. Myers said that the most advisable thing for Kansas to do is to install the new CEECO equipment. Basically, this would involve a new recorder, new voting stations, and reworking of the totalizing equipment. Myers said the new equipment is faster, quieter, simpler, and smaller than the present Kansas installation. The new equipment has fewer moving parts and connections. The new equipment is about three times as fast as present, he said. It takes about six seconds for "totals" only.

The new voting station, as presently designed, has YES, NO, PRESENT, and PAGE buttons, in a vertical format. The PRESENT button could be omitted, if that were desired. There also is a lock on the new voting station.

Mr. Callison said that the new equipment could produce recurring or preliminary totals in about six seconds, counted in the same general way as by the existing equipment, but much faster.

The CEECO representative said there would be no need to change the existing wall indicator boards, page boards, or the Speaker's indicator board. They also stated that the large cabinet which houses the wiring would not have to be changed in any fundamental way, but could be made smaller.

Cost of the proposed new equipment would be \$15,000 for installation, then \$4,500 per year for ten years. This would be a lease-purchase type of arrangement, replacing the agreement entered into in 1955. The cost figures do not include any fundamental changes in the sound system. The contract could include a provision

that CEECO would automatically install new improvements as they might be developed during the first five years of a contract, at no cost to the state. A question was asked as to the cost of outright purchase of the voting system with the new equipment added. Mr. Myers said he did not have that information, but it would be provided subsequently.

The CEECO representatives said the new equipment could be installed without disturbing the House Chamber, although it might be necessary to move the desks about six inches. There would be no basic changes in the wiring. CEECO would like to have at least six months to install the proposed new equipment.

Mr. Callison said that the Missouri House of Representatives used the new CEECO equipment in 1967, and such equipment is basically the same as proposed for Kansas. CEECO is installing its new equipment in the New York Assembly, and it is negotiating for new installations in Louisiana and Minnesota (both the House and Senate in each state).

Improvement of Existing Equipment

Mr. Ryan pointed out that no one has authority to order or negotiate for installing new roll-call equipment in the Kansas House at the present time, and that the real issue now is to arrange for improved, satisfactory operation of the existing equipment during the 1968 general session. Ryan referred to that part of the lease agreement whereby CEECO agreed to maintain properly the roll-call system during the entire period of the lease-rental agreement by having its service representative call prior to the opening of each session to check and adjust the roll-call system, and to make such repairs as deemed necessary for dependable operation of the system, with all maintenance service to be provided without cost to the state. It was further pointed out that any possible favorable consideration of CEECO's proposition to install new equipment after the 1968 Session certainly would be influenced by the performance of the existing equipment during that session.

Mrs. Young listed the following problems concerning operation of the current equipment during the 1967 Session: the totals on the indicator boards did not always add to 125; printed totals on the punched roll-call sheets did not always add to 125; sometimes the roll-call sheet perforations were out of alignment; the recorder threw oil occasionally; at times the recorder sheered off punch pins; at times the indicator boards showed one person voting both Yes and No; the bulbs on the indicator boards burned out; and the carriage (shuttle pins) in the recorder stuck a number of times.

It also was pointed out that the warning bells or chimes for roll-call votes did not work. Apparently, they were not pre-tested before the 1967 Session.

Another problem mentioned by the State Architect's staff was that the role of the CEECO representative in Topeka (Mr. Oppitz) was not clearly defined with respect to working on the roll-call system. At times, apparently, there has been some confusion and delay with respect to Mr. Oppitz attempting to repair or adjust the machine when it was out of order. At other times, Mrs. Young said, Oppitz helped repair the machine. Mr. Myers replied that Oppitz was being paid a "good price" by CEECO to be on call for local repair of the system, including sound.

The CEECO representatives said that testing of the roll-call equipment before the 1966 and 1967 Sessions was conducted by a different man than in the past, and that perhaps he was not as thorough as Robert Gullick who has pre-tested the machine during the earlier years of operation in Kansas.

The CEECO representatives agreed to take the following steps in order to improve the present roll-call installation before the 1968 Session: take the recorder back to Chicago on July 11, 1967, and overhaul and test it completely; check all voting stations and have the proper number of spare stations on hand in Topeka; check the warning bell system; clarify Mr. Oppitz's role with respect to maintenance and repair of the system locally; and pre-test the system thoroughly in Topeka before the 1968 Session (Mr. Callison said he would try to come to Topeka personally for this purpose, but if he cannot, every effort would be made to send Mr. Gullick). It was understood that these steps would be taken at no cost to the state.

CEECO also offered to train one of the state's electricians before the 1968 Session in the basic elements of maintaining the roll-call system. Mr. Hale suggested, however, that state employees should not assume any maintenance responsibility under the existing contract.

Mr. Myers said that CEECO could not guarantee 100% operation of the present equipment in 1968 even after the above steps have been taken, because of the age and type of equipment involved. He stated that CEECO does not want to put a lot of money into repair of the present system in view of the possibility of new equipment being installed in the near future. Several times during the conference Mr. Myers said CEECO would not like to become involved in a substantial amount of work on the existing equipment. If the existing equipment is retained, Myers indicated that CEECO would like to negotiate a new maintenance agreement at a higher annual charge.

Mr. Hale said that Mr. Webb would act as coordinator with CEECO and its local representative on behalf of the architectural services division for repair, maintenance, and testing of the roll-call and sound equipment, and for ordering name plates and continuous roll-call forms.