

PRELIMINARY REPORT

STUDY OF THE PREPARATION OF STATE DOCUMENTS BY THE LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU AND THE IOWA CODE OFFICE

I. As a follow-up to the report at the last meeting, I would like to report the following findings and conceptual recommendations:

1. The major general finding is that the preparation of the various state documents under study has grown in a piecemeal fashion by both administrative custom and statutory change from relatively simple beginnings into a very complex and relatively unstructured set of operations. Due to the lack of structure, these operations are less coordinated and more cumbersome than they need be and have caused some production problems, aggravated by the computer situation. These problems are certainly not due to any of the numerous organizations and personnel involved, but to the structural situation. As indicated initially, this situation has gradually developed and no one has "stepped back" and taken an objective, overall look at the entire situation -- at least not until the study begun by the Service Committee.

2. The first of the major conceptual recommendations is that centralized decision-making authorities and well-defined lines of authority need to be statutorily established for the production of the major types of state documents. Currently eleven major organizations are involved in the production of these documents with no centralized direction. The Legislative Service Bureau seems to be the logical focus of authority for the Iowa Code documents and the Administrative Rules Review Committee for the administrative rule documents, with specified functions and appropriate consultative roles for other organizations.

3. More statutory flexibility needs to be established for these documents, such as in regard to frequency of publication and manner of distribution of the Administrative Code Supplements.

4. An intensive study needs to be made of the problems that occurred this year in the legislative computer-typesetting computer interface and recommendations developed in an attempt to avoid it next year.

5. Study needs to begin in regard to the long-range computerization of the administrative rules process, akin to what has already been done in the statutory law process. This was in the original proposal for the legislative computer system.

6. In regard to free distribution of these documents, my initial impression is that it has grown completely out of control. Further study is needed with a view to "tightening" the relevant statutes if necessary and in view of the overall cost picture for these documents.

7. As a follow-up detail from prior meetings, the status of one Code Office proofreader should be changed from 3/4 FTE to 1 FTE.

II. In regard to the above points, if they meet with the approval of the Service Committee I will proceed to administratively implement those which can be so done and work to develop specific statutory proposals for those requiring statutory action, in consultation with the various interested parties and present the statutory proposals to the Service Committee early in the Session. If appropriate I will seek management consultant advice from state academic resources.

Respectfully submitted,

DONOVAN PEETERS

December 6, 1985

Mr. Donovan Peters, Director
Legislative Service Bureau
Statehouse

LOCAL

Dear Donovan,

I have compiled the costs of the First Session, 71st General Assembly
Session Laws and wish to submit my proposal for the selling price.

The computation is as follows:

Printing Costs (W.C. Brown)	\$32,086.00
Compilation Cost - Code Editor	\$25,098.00
Compilation Cost - Service Bureau	\$ 2,828.00
Typesetting - House of Representatives	\$ 5,190.00
TOTAL	\$65,202.00

$\$65,202.00 \div 4,500 = \14.49 per volume

Distribution Cost = $\$ 5.51$ per volume

Total $\$20.00$ per volume

My recommendation is that the selling price should be \$20.00 plus \$0.80
sales tax. Please advise me if the Legislative Council agrees.

Respectfully,



Vern Lundquist
Superintendent of Printing

VL/mb