

Legislative Council  
Research Department  
5th Floor, Statehouse  
Topeka, Kansas

Attn: Mr. Richard W. Ryan,  
Acting Director

Dear Dick:

The state printing plant has made a preliminary study of the request of the Joint Committee on Legislative Facilities into the relative costs of printing the legislative bills and resolutions (based on the 1965 session) under the following plan which is a major departure from the present format:

1. Follow the present procedure up to the point of engrossment EXCEPT that Senate amended bills will carry boldface Italic on all amendments whereas both Houses now use boldface type on amendments and all new material would appear in Italic type, with the exception of complete sections where the word "Section" and the section number would appear in Italic. The engrossing step would be eliminated entirely.
2. The "net result" approach wherein all new material would appear in Italics, existing law in Roman, all existing law to be stricken would appear in cancelled type and committee reports would be attached at every stage where amendments are made. Any new material that is deleted later is to be dropped from the bill. The engrossing step would be eliminated entirely.

It is expected that the first procedure would increase the cost of handling the Senate amended bills by 35 percent, or the overall cost of printing bills and resolutions by an estimated 15 percent. This would mean approximately \$13,500 (1965 cost was \$90,000).

On those bills that go directly from the standing committee of either house to the other house in alternative No. 2, there would be no increase in cost of printing. HOWEVER, bills that are amended by the committee of the whole would increase in cost because of the added composition in the committee report. The amount and extent of these increases would vary according to the length and complexity of the report. A rough estimate would be not in excess of one percent additional, or approximately \$900, based on 1965 costs.

IT SHOULD BE NOTED, HOWEVER, that the only way the reader could determine what had happened to a bill under this alternative would be by reading the entire committee report each time it was amended. Furthermore, he would have to read all of the committee reports in order to know who did what to the bill. In addition, there are some procedural problems, notably:

All amendments could not be shown in Italic type because when entire sections of the present law are added to a bill as an amendment these entire sections would have to be shown in Italic type. This leaves the printer at a loss as to what to do with the new material added to these sections after that point.

The study was also directed to determine what changes would occur in the cost of printing the session laws under the following alternative procedures:

1. With all new material in Italic, existing law deleted in strike type, Roman for the law that is not changed.
2. Section headings (only) in Italics in the new law. In existing law: new material in Italic, provided it is not a whole section BUT where a new section is added to existing law, it would appear as follows:

Section 4. (in Italic), the rest in Roman. EXCEPT, existing law is deleted in strike type and the law that is not changed would appear in Roman type.

Under either <sup>method</sup>, there would be a very nominal change in the cost of producing the session laws, probably less than 3½ percent overall--meaning an increase of less than \$900 over the \$27,607 cost of producing the book--based on the 1965 session laws. This increase would be caused by the growth in the volume of type made necessary by the changes so that canceled lines, etc., could be shown in the final version.

It should be borne in mind that these estimates can only be based on the assumption that one legislative session would produce approximately the same quantity of bills and resolutions with roughly the same number, kind, and extent of amendments thereto as another.

In making these studies, the research department has learned from the state printing plant that there is a further refinement possible which should result in a substantial reduction in the cost of producing the bills and resolutions by as much as 15 to 20 percent. Furthermore, this latter method would provide the legislature with distinguishing type faces for each action that a bill undergoes without at any time adding to the cost of producing printing for both the legislative session and the session laws.

It is recommended that an actual cost comparison be authorized by the committee, showing exact costs of preparing a bill under each of these methods so

that the study will be completely valid. This can be done at a nominal cost by preparing a hypothetical bill, taking it through all the legislative actions that could possibly affect it and keeping a record of actual costs of all the printings.

Another possible cost-saving has been suggested by the state printing plant on amended bills. This would involve bills that are subjected to extensive amendment in which a number of sections are amended and new sections inserted. Under the present system, these changes are printed in the actual bill itself and then again in the committee report at the end of the bill. The plant proposes that the committee report mention those sections in the committee report only by section number, i. e., "Sections 4 through 10 ....." rather than reprinting them in full.

The legislature spent just a little over \$90,000 for the printing of the regular bills and resolutions during the 1965 session. It is conceivable that as much as \$13,000 could be saved by a few procedural changes such as those suggested in the latter refinement.