

M I N U T E S

Joint Committee on Legislative Facilities

April 18, 1968

Members present were Chairman Hill, Representatives Doyen and Van Cleave and Senators Warren and Bennett.

Conferees in the morning from the IBM Corporation were Skip Gladfelter, Andy Shaw and Jim Saracini. In the afternoon, John Weeks, Revisor of Statutes and Bob Alderson from the Revisor's office were conferees. Other persons in attendance were Richard Ryan, Reed Whitaker and Ben Barrett from the Research Department and Fred Carman from the Revisor's office.

Morning Session

IBM Proposal. IBM representatives discussed findings of their study concerning the equipment and facilities that would be required if IBM equipment were used for bill and resolution printing for the legislature.

The IBM representatives listed three possible locations for the printing and reproduction operation. They were the state printing plant, the central duplicating agency and somewhere, equipped for that purpose, in the State House. Of the three locations, IBM officials preferred Central Duplicating. Like the printing plant, it has experience in doing offset press work, and it is accustomed to the assembling process.

About two months of orientation to the IBM equipment would be needed before the operators could be trained to produce work at the desired output level. Persons in the Budget Division, committee secretaries, certain other legislative employees, and persons in the Revisor's office would need to be included in the system to make it function properly. IBM recommended the use of Model IV and Model V Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter units in typing the bill in preparation of the original tape. One or more Magnetic Tape Selectric Composers would be located at Central Duplicating for printing out bills for offset press work.

The IBM representatives did not actually list the total equipment requirements to do the bill printing for the Kansas legislature. They did estimate that under their proposal, capital expenditures for equipment for the first year under their system would be about \$50,000. In addition to equipment costs there would

be an expense of from \$8,000 to \$10,000 for magnetic tape. Additional amounts would cover the purchase of extra type fonts, typewriter ribbons and paper. It was estimated that the printing operation would cost about \$30,000 per year. That figure would be basically for labor and materials. Thus, the cost for the first year would be about \$80,000.

IBM representatives preferred locating the bill printing function at Central Duplicating for three reasons. First, the agency has offset printing equipment. The printing plant also has offset reproduction equipment, but IBM said it is inadequate to handle legislative printing. Second, the printing plant is basically geared to the hot metal process. Although the plant can handle offset work, the plant layout is designed for letterpress work, whereas Central Duplicating is designed for offset or "cold type" work. (It was noted that Central Duplicating would need to acquire at least two more offset presses to handle the legislative work.) Finally, the cost of labor would be less expensive than if the job were done at the state printing plant. Skilled typesetters would not need to be used to run the IBM equipment. Trained secretarial people would be expected to handle the job.

The results of the study indicate that the work in the Revisor's office of typing bills and committee reports and putting them on tape could not be markedly improved. By current standards, the production of those typists has been at a very high level. The problem would be retraining these people on the IBM system. It would be necessary to "sell" all persons connected with the proposed bill printing system so that maximum cooperation and understanding would result.

IBM representatives explained that equipment purchased by the legislature could serve as "back up" equipment for various state agencies during the part of the year when the legislature is not in session. Gladfelter stated that forecasting the potential workload for the session would be important in planning for the exact amount of equipment that would be needed for legislative printing.

Under the proposal, the bills and resolutions would be typed in the Revisor's office, as now. The bills would be prepared on magnetic tape, and there would be an accompanying hard copy. Codes would be recorded in the tape, and the markings on the hard copy would show what instructions are to be followed at each stop code in the tape. The tape and hard copy would be sent to Central Duplicating, where the tape would be played out on the composing unit. The stop code orders would be followed on the print-out. The composing unit would prepare the copy to be used in offset printing at a speed of about 20 lines per minute if uninterrupted. Amendments and committee reports would be prepared by the committee secretaries, certain clerks in the legislature and by the Revisor's office. They would be sent to Central Duplicating where the secretaries would update tapes and prepare new hard copy to accompany the tape. Gladfelter said that in addition to MTSC'S at

Central Duplicating there should also be a selectric composer. The unit could be used for typing copy when an MTSC is down. A tape perfected to show the bill in its final form as passed by the legislature could easily be used to prepare camera-ready copy for enrolled bills, session laws, and possibly, to prepare copy in a point size used in the statute books.

IBM representatives pointed out the future potential of using IBM recording equipment in setting up satellite units in various locations in the state so that bills could be prepared prior to the session. They said that they are proposing this kind of arrangement in several states. Thus far, none has established "satellite" bill recording stations.

Gladfelter said that IBM could maintain the present quality of bill printing with their system. He pointed out the quality of the bill printing in Kansas is better than that of other states IBM has studied. Any difference in the quality of the final product under the IBM system as compared to the present system was thought to be minimal. Gladfelter said the delivery time under the proposed system would be about the same as is presently available. IBM officials stated that they felt a cost reduction was possible under their proposal. In response to a question by Senator Bennett, IBM representatives said the proposal did not contemplate any reductions in the work force of the printing plant.

By a unanimous vote the Committee adopted a motion by Senator Bennett that consideration of the IBM printing proposal be discontinued. The proposal did not seem to offer sufficient improvement in the legislative bill and resolution printing process to warrant approval. It did not cover other legislative printing such as calendars, journals and forms. Presumably these would still be handled by the printing plant. The procedure for handling committee amendments was quite decentralized. New administration of this function would be required. Such a system is not easily developed.

A letter will be forwarded to IBM over the signature of the Chairman cancelling the authorization to order equipment signed by the Chairman on August 3, 1967.

Afternoon Session

Kansas Statutes Annotated. The Committee considered the problems associated with the rapidly growing K.S.A. supplements.

John Weeks said that as originally designed and presented to the legislature, the K.S.A.'s would not have included the individual indexes found in each volume. There would have been a single general index volume. An amendment adopted late in the 1963 session provided for the individual volume indexes, thereby making each volume larger than was originally planned. Weeks explained that the problem of handling the rapidly expanding volumes

of statutes is one facing all of the states. It is not peculiar to Kansas. There are several alternatives available for meeting the problem:

1. Using cumulative pocket parts and replacement volumes as needed.
2. Adding permanently bound supplement volumes.
3. Using cumulative supplements with heavy paper backs that will stand alongside the respective volumes of the statutes.
4. Using looseleaf volumes of statutes and looseleaf current services.
5. Using supplements to supplement pocket parts.

The Revisor suggested the best approach would be to add permanent bound volumes by "splitting" present volumes, and to continue to use the cumulative supplement pocket parts along with parent volumes. (Estimates of the cost of "splitting" a volume are on file in the Committee notebooks.)

If this procedure were used, the Revisor recommended that Volume 6, because of its size, should be selected as the first replacement volume. It should be divided into volumes 6A and 6B. The index accompanying each volume should be eliminated, with the exceptions of the Uniform Commercial Code and the Constitution. The state and federal constitutions, now found in Volume 6, should be republished in a separate, new volume. Mr. Weeks proposed that this change be authorized by the 1969 Legislature.

Agreement was reached that the second volume which should be split is the general index. Under the Revisor's schedule, this would be accomplished in 1970. After that, Mr. Weeks said Volume 5 would probably be the next volume needing to be split.

Weeks stated that when the pocket parts become too voluminous, it is more expensive to reprint them than to issue split volumes, which would have the effect of reducing the size of pocket parts and dispersing more widely supplementing material.

Chairman Hill inquired about the relative costs of publishing two sets of statutes. One would contain the index and annotations, the other would not. The set without annotations or index might serve as the volumes for at least a portion of the free distribution provided for in K.S.A. 1967 Supp. 77-138.

The Committee requested Mr. Weeks to draft a bill for presentation in 1969 to provide for splitting Volume 6 into two books, and for removing the constitutions from Volume 6 and publishing them in a separate new volume. The bill should include authority to split the index into two volumes as the next step.

Another suggestion for inclusion in the bill was to provide for eliminating the individual indexes when volumes are republished. This would not apply to the Uniform Commercial Code or to the volume containing the constitutions.

The motion making these requests was offered by Senator Bennett, seconded by Representative Van Cleave and unanimously adopted. The Committee will submit a report to the legislature in 1969 carrying out these recommendations.

Publication of Official Acts of the Legislature

Fred Carman presented a draft letter to the Attorney General requesting an opinion concerning the authenticated session laws being accepted by the courts as proof of the laws of the state, with the addition of Italic and strike-type. The letter was approved for transmittal to the Attorney General over the signature of the Chairman.

Committee System. The Committee reviewed tables prepared by the Research Department concerning the workload of legislative committees during the 1965, 1967, and 1968 sessions. The tables are on file in the committee notebooks. Senator Bennett and Representative Van Cleave discussed problems related to the size and workload of the judiciary committees of the House and Senate. The Committee is interested in determining which states subdivide judiciary committees into two or more committee assignments. Also the Committee is interested in knowing whether other states confine the judiciary committees to lawyers only, and into what general areas the judiciary committee bills could be grouped. Recent sessions could serve as a guide for checking out this item. The staff will assemble information concerning these questions for the Committee.

The Committee reviewed draft questionnaires to be sent to all members of the legislature concerning the need for committee consolidation. The staff was directed to make certain changes in the questionnaire and to send them out to the legislators. Results of the tabulations will be reported at the next meeting.

The next meeting date was tentatively set for June 13. Among other items on the agenda, the Chief Clerk of the House, Secretary of the Senate, and Malcolm Wilson (Secretary of State's Office) will be invited to discuss enrollment and engrossment of legislative documents. The Committee will also consider plans for further action on roll-call equipment for the House of Representatives.

The meeting was adjourned.