

M I N U T E S

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

OF THE

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

April 18, 1979

The Administration Committee of the Legislative Council was called to order by Senator Calvin O. Hultman, acting as temporary Committee Chairperson, at 8:15 a.m., Wednesday, April 18, 1979 in Senate Committee Room 24 of the State House in Des Moines. Members present for the meeting were:

Senator James Briles
Senator Calvin Hultman
Senator Lowell Junkins
Representative John Clark
Representative Roger Halvorson

Also present were Director Serge Garrison and Phil Burks of the Legislative Service Bureau, Code Editor Wayne Faupel and Deputy Code Editor Phyllis Barry, Superintendent of Printing Vern Lundquist and Secretary of the Senate Frank Stork.

Senator Briles nominated Senator Hultman for permanent Administration Committee Chairperson. Representative Clark nominated Representative Halvorson for this position. Representative Halvorson seconded the nomination of Senator Hultman. Representative Clark then withdrew the nomination of Representative Halvorson.

Senator Hultman was elected Committee Chairperson by a unanimous voice vote.

Chairperson Hultman called for nominations for the position of Administration Committee Vice-Chairperson. Senator Briles nominated Representative Halvorson for this position, and Representative Halvorson was elected by a unanimous voice vote.

Senator Hultman noted that the present meeting had been called for the purpose of determining the manner in which the 1979 Session Laws will be compiled and prepared for printing. He stated that on the basis of the discussion at the previous day's Legislative Council meeting, it is his understanding that there is agreement that a wider page format with "justified" margins on both the left and right sides of the page will be used in printing the 1979 Session Laws; the area of disagreement between Mr. Garrison and Mr. Faupel relates to the order in which the individual session laws will appear in the compiled Session Laws volume, and the exact procedure by which camera-ready copy will be prepared for the printer.

Mr. Garrison noted that one matter which had not been specifically discussed on the previous day relates to the use of wider lines in printing the text of appropriation bills. Because of the narrow column format which has been followed in past years, there is a possibility of substantial savings in numbers of pages required to print the appropriation acts. Mr. Lundquist said the savings in number of pages required to print the appropriation acts alone could be as high as 50%. Mr. Faupel indicated he is in full agreement with Mr. Garrison and Mr. Lundquist on this particular point.

The discussion then turned to the areas of disagreement between Mr. Faupel and Mr. Garrison. Mr. Faupel reiterated the statements he had made at the previous day's Legislative Council meeting regarding the value of arranging material in each edition of the Session Laws in essentially the same manner as the related material appears in the Code of Iowa. He asserted that this arrangement is a great convenience to the user, since it makes each edition of the Session Laws in effect a supplement to the Code. He added that this practice has been followed for many years, and was at one time required by statute.

With respect to the matter of indexing, Mr. Faupel stated that the index to the 1979 Session Laws will contain citations for particular subjects by both chapter and section number, and that the index is already being prepared. Mr. Garrison commented that this will be a significant improvement in the indexing, although he added he would also like to see a page number assigned to each topic listed in the index. Mrs. Barry expressed doubt that page numbers would be of much additional value in an index which cites both chapter and section numbers. Mr. Garrison indicated that he remains convinced of the value of page numbers as well as chapter and section numbers in the Session Laws index.

Mr. Garrison continued by arguing for greater reliance on the Session Laws index, as opposed to order of arrangement, to locate material in a particular edition of the Session Laws. He pointed out that the Code-related arrangement cannot be fully consistent in any event, since it is not unusual for large bills to contain amendments to a number of chapters located in various parts of the Code. He suggested that Legislative Service Bureau staff personnel are qualified and have some time available in the later weeks of most legislative sessions to provide assistance in the amount of editorial work necessary to prepare for printing of the Session Laws, and to assist in preparing the Session Law index.

Senator Hultman explored the possibility of printing the Session Laws by signatures (i.e., 32-page units by which printers produce books). Mr. Lundquist said it is not economically feasible for a printer to do this, and Mr. Garrison agreed that this is also a weak point in the procedure which he advocates. However, Mr. Garrison added that it is possible to begin computer runs of

camera-ready copy ahead of time so that all of the copy can be delivered to a printer almost immediately upon expiration of the 30-day period after adjournment of a session during which the governor may veto bills passed at the end of the session. Mr. Faupel said he does not believe that beginning computer runs ahead of time in the manner suggested by Mr. Garrison will save any significant amount of time.

There was some discussion of the location and type of computer-related equipment which might be used to prepare material for printing of the Session Laws. Senator Hultman commented he had determined that the equipment used by the Senate for production of its Journals do not have an interface with the computer from which it is possible to obtain the text of the enrolled bills, and he expressed doubt about the economic feasibility of developing such an arrangement. It was noted that the similar equipment used by the House of Representatives does have such a computer interface, but Mr. Garrison said his concern with respect to that equipment is that it may be heavily utilized in the later weeks of a session when the work of preparing for printing of the Session Laws should be underway. He also noted that during the 1978 Session at least one of the operators assigned to this equipment had accumulated an extremely large amount of compensatory time by the end of the session, and he expressed doubt that such an individual would be enthusiastic about staying on to help with preparation of camera-ready copy for the Session Laws immediately after a session. Mr. Faupel indicated he shares Mr. Garrison's doubts about the feasibility of utilizing the House Journal Room equipment for preparation of the Session Laws for the reasons stated by Mr. Garrison, but it was agreed that Mr. Faupel and Mr. Garrison will discuss this matter further with Chief Clerk of the House David Wray.

After further discussion of their points of disagreement, Mr. Garrison stated he is willing to defer to Mr. Faupel's views regarding arrangement of material in the Session Laws in the interest of cooperation between the two offices in preparation of the 1979 Session Laws. Mr. Faupel stated he is in a position to send the first thirty bills enacted by the 1979 Session of the General Assembly to the Legislative Service Bureau immediately, with temporary chapter numbers assigned, so that preparation of camera-ready copy can be begun. He agreed that he and his staff will review suggestions from Legislative Service Bureau staff members regarding indexing of the 1979 Session Laws, and will collate their suggested index items with the indexes prepared in the Office of the Code Editor.

In further discussion, Mr. Faupel and Mrs. Barry indicated that they have in fact prepared copy for delivery to printers before expiration of the 30-day period for post-session gubernatorial vetoes on occasion in the past. However, they stressed that care must be taken in doing this, so that any bill or item which is

vetoed by the governor will be properly deleted or noted in the material prepared for printing in the Session Laws. Mr. Garrison agreed with this procedure, and said that he feels this will save time.

Senator Hultman then summarized his understanding of the agreements which had been reached with respect to the preparation of the 1979 Session Laws as follows:

1. There is agreement between the Office of the Code Editor and the Legislative Service Bureau with respect to format for printing of the Session Laws.
2. The Legislative Service Bureau will run out camera-ready copy for the 1979 Session Laws on its terminals.
3. The Code Editor will send to the Legislative Service Bureau bills enacted by the General Assembly, with temporary chapter numbers assigned, and this material will be collated at the end of the process when a decision is made about the exact order in which the material will appear in the compiled Session Laws.
4. Preparation of camera-ready copy for publication of the Session Laws will begin during the post-session veto period.

There was also a discussion of preparations for publishing the Code of 1981. Mr. Faupel noted that the 1979 Code was the first to be printed directly from material generated by the electronic tape code, and that this procedure required very extensive proofreading and also entailed other delays that were due to lack of experience with the procedure. He said that in preparing the 1981 Code it would be necessary to proofread only those portions affected by actions of the Sixty-eighth General Assembly, and that the actual printing work should go more smoothly since there will be some prior experience from which to benefit. However, he said that he hopes to proofread the entire Code of 1979 against the electronic tape of the Code, since a few discrepancies are known to have occurred through human error.

Mr. Garrison said that while there is no question that the Code Editor has final authority for preparing the text of the new Code, he hopes that the knowledge and experience of members of the Legislative Service Bureau staff will be fully utilized in placement and preparation of new and revised material in the forthcoming Code of 1981. He pointed out in some complex areas--such as the state foundation program for elementary and secondary school aid, and the consumer credit code--there are few if any individuals who are as knowledgeable as the particular staff persons assigned to these areas by the Legislative Service Bureau. Mr. Garrison noted that on at least one or two occasions, changes have been made in editing the Code which appeared to be purely grammatical or corrective but which in fact had substantive effect.

He urged that the various Service Bureau staff persons involved in particular areas of law be consulted about any such changes. Finally, he stressed the importance of knowing exactly where material will appear in the new Code so that preparation of bills for the 1981 Session can proceed promptly. He asked that when editorial changes are made to the Code, the Bureau be informed of such fact so the changes can be reflected in bill drafts being prepared. He noted that errors resulted in bills this year because of unanticipated editorial changes.

Mr. Lundquist suggested that while full reliance should be placed on the Legislative Service Bureau's equipment to prepare the camera-ready copy which will actually be used for publication of the 1979 Session Laws, some experimentation with use of terminal equipment located elsewhere might also be carried on simultaneously. He said that in addition to the equipment previously referred to in the House journal room, his own facility has some such equipment available. He suggested that the experience gained in such experimentation might be valuable in future years. There was general agreement to this suggestion.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

PHILIP E. BURKS
Senior Research Analyst

SERGE H. GARRISON
Director