

PERFORMANCE REPORT  
ON THE  
OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
FOR THE PERIOD  
JULY 1, 1989 - JUNE 30, 1990

---

JULY 1, 1990

To ensure that we continue to do all our work well, the Office of the Revisor of Statutes has established a program of self-evaluation at the end of each fiscal year. This written review is the office's twelfth evaluation of its yearly performance. It is intended to provide a more systematic look at how the office has performed than merely looking at production statistics or making a general judgment of how well the office is doing. The report is divided into two parts. The performance of the drafting and publishing duties, in terms of production volume, is shown in the tables on the following pages. In the second part, the office's performance on each of its assigned functions is then analyzed.

The functions of the Office of the Revisor of Statutes are established by law, rule, or custom. Twenty-six identifiable functions were performed during some portion of the year. Of that number, five require only minimal work. No new functions were added during the year and no functions were removed or have come to an end. The principal functions of the office remain drafting and publishing.

A review of the twenty-six assigned functions shows that the office continues to provide diverse products and services. The office has continually sought to improve those products and the delivery of services. The office also provides its products and services efficiently: almost all staff do more than one function and, despite the increased workload, the number of drafting attorneys and production staff has remained the same for many years.

The matter of most interest in the office's work for the year has been the continued remarkable increase in that work. Every biennium since 1980, the number of documents handled has increased by an average of twenty percent over the previous biennium. The total increase in work has been 144 percent over 1980. Despite that monumental increase, there has been no increase in the number of attorneys and production staff employed by the office. Overtime work, already at a high level, remained about the same. This was achieved through the hard work of the staff and the efficiencies of new and improved computer applications.

In the publication area, the press run on Minnesota Statutes has increased by fifteen percent since 1976. Furthermore, there were unsold copies in 1976. We expect to sell out all copies for both 1988 and 1990. This is attributable to the efforts at improving the editorial quality of the set as well as augmented marketing efforts.

Minnesota Rules also sold out its press run for the first time since it started in 1983. That is also a tribute to the quality of the set as well as to marketing efforts.

The publication of a CD-ROM version of Minnesota Statutes continues. Sales are modest but increasing. We hope that, within a few years, we will be selling enough copies to publish the edition without a subsidy. In addition to CD-ROM, the office is continuing to explore other electronic means of publication. Two are of principal interest. One is a publication of Statutes on floppy disk with compressed data. This method would enable purchasers to load statutory data on the hard disk of a PC. The key advantage of this technology is that it would not be necessary for someone with a PC to buy a special reader and software as is necessary for CD-ROM.

The other new electronic publishing venture is the creation by Intertech of a legislative data system. The Revisor will furnish the data, but Intertech would have a common software usable by anyone on their system. It would be available by dialup to the public. The result would be an on-line system available to everyone. The Revisor has not attempted such a system both because the mission of the office is internal legislative support not external service, and because the office didn't have either the system size or money to create a system sufficient to operate a large public-access data base. The work to create the system has been going on for a year and the system should be operational by next session.

The office is contemplating a major change in its computer operations. Up until this point, the computer staff has developed a variety of separate applications. A switch to open architecture using X Windows technology is being considered. This would facilitate future growth, flexibility, and connectedness of legislative applications. However, the cost will be a period of about two years of no growth in the present system while the groundwork is laid for a switch to open architecture.

Preparation for a major administrative change has been under way for the last six months. For fifteen years the office has employed a contract accountant to manage the office's financial operations. That accountant has decided to devote himself full time to a new career. Consequently, office staff have had to prepare to assume the whole responsibility to work with the finances. That preparation has primarily included training on the general ledger system for managers, administrative staff, and computer staff. The office's auditors have also agreed to provide emergency assistance and question resolution.

There has also been a growing imbalance in workloads among the office's professional staff. Suggested solutions on this have been received since the end of the legislative session. Discussions on proposed solutions and implementation are progressing. Again, a resolution is expected before the session.

The Statutes reindexing project is proving to be a project of awesome proportions. In order to speed the work to completion, additional contract indexers have been hired to assist with the work until at least July 1, 1991. The amount of thought and effort going into this work should be evident when the new index is published in the fall of 1992.

The office may have another major editorial project. All of Minnesota Statutes has been published in CD-ROM form except for the court rules. Including court rules in it was impossible because of the multiplicity of formats in the fifty different sets of court rules. We encouraged the Minnesota Supreme Court to permit us to help them adopt a uniform system of renumbering all of the state's court rules. This is intended to facilitate the use of court rules in electronic form. The court is considering our suggestion.

The office is also expanding its use of personal computers augmenting the mainframe computer applications.

All told, the office made significant progress in many different areas. The office's staff expects to make corrections in those areas where problems were noted and to continue to make progress in all areas.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

TOTAL PRODUCTION

Session	Bills	Amendments	Comparisons	Conf. Comm. Rpts.	Misc. Doc.	Engross	Enroll	Resol. Enroll	Comm. Rpts	Admin. Rules Operations	Statutory Rule Editing	Rule Editing	Total	Change
1977	3301	388	197	50(Est)	--	1324	455	--	--	--	2703	--	8418	
<u>1978</u>	<u>1418</u>	<u>400(Est)</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>50(Est)</u>	--	<u>975</u>	<u>342</u>	--	--	--	<u>2162</u>	--	<u>5518</u>	
Total	4719	788	368	100(Est)	--	2299	797	--	--	--	4865	--	13936	
1979 & Spec.	3275	425	138	49	--	1078	348	5	--	--	2130	--	7448	
<u>1980</u>	<u>1571</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>55</u>	--	<u>892</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>5</u>	--	--	<u>3042</u>	--	<u>6482</u>	
Total	4846	879	318	104	--	1970	631	10	--	--	5172	--	13930	Nil
1981 & Spec.	2936	405	227	72	--	1048	406	4	--	--	4397	--	9495	
<u>1982 &amp; Spec.</u>	<u>1562</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>62</u>	--	<u>896</u>	<u>286</u>	<u>5</u>	--	--	<u>956</u>	<u>2675</u>	<u>7005</u>	
Total	4498	809	386	134	--	1944	692	9	--	956	7072	--	16500	18%
1983	2607	566	225	92	--	1261	387	11	445	892	3922	--	10408	
<u>1984</u>	<u>1651</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>994</u>	<u>298</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>371</u>	<u>1213</u>	<u>3612</u>	--	<u>9120</u>	
Total	4258	1112	437	132	172	2255	685	22	816	2105	7534	--	19528	18%
1985 & Spec.	3170	1109	256	79	389	1347	335	7	478	1673	4543	3051	16437	
<u>1986 &amp; Spec.</u>	<u>1536</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>112</u>	<u>808</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>280</u>	<u>1342</u>	<u>2412</u>	<u>1048</u>	<u>8661</u>	
Total	4706	1819	437	137	501	2155	507	9	758	3015	6955	4099	25098	29%
1987 & Spec.	3052	1020*	246	67	161	1660	410	10	606	1148	6167	3453	18000	
<u>1988</u>	<u>2115</u>	<u>1044*</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>193</u>	<u>1274</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>450</u>	<u>1548</u>	<u>2773</u>	<u>875</u>	<u>11015</u>	
Total	5167	2064*	520	206	354	2934	734	16	1056	2696	8940	4328	29015	16%
1989 & Spec.	3356	1268*	234	152	195	1627	362	6	557	1668	5833	5075	19883	
<u>1990</u>	<u>2181**</u>	<u>1506**</u>	<u>224**</u>	<u>137**</u>	<u>389**</u>	<u>1014</u>	<u>257</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>333</u>	<u>1782</u>	<u>4096</u>	<u>1680</u>	<u>13600</u>	
Total	5537	2774	458	289	584	2641	619	7	890	3450	9929	6755	33933	17%

\* Includes floor amendments. Floor amendments are not included in earlier numbers.

\*\* Special Session 1989 is included in these numbers since it occurred in the 1990 fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

STATUTORY EDITORIAL OPERATIONS

Session Year	Session Chapters	Session Law Pages	Average Pages Per Chapter	Statute or Supplement Pages	Statutory Sections- Amended	Statutory Sections- New	Statutory Sections- Repealed	Total Statutory Sections- Other	Statutory Sections- Affected	Session Laws Press Run (Activity)	Statutes or Supplement Press Run (Activity)
1975	437	1623	3.72	958	1335	851	714	0	2900	2750(dumped some)	
<u>1976</u>	<u>348</u>	<u>1405</u>	<u>4.04</u>	<u>7509</u>	<u>1533</u>	<u>748</u>	<u>782</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3063</u>	2750(dumped some)	2750(dumped some)
Total	785	3028	3.86	8467	2868	1599	1496	0	5963		
1977	455	1449	3.19	874	1508	652	543	0	2703	2750(dumped some)	
<u>1978</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>1251</u>	<u>3.66</u>	<u>8253</u>	<u>1315</u>	<u>535</u>	<u>312</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2162</u>	2750(dumped some)	2900(dumped some)
Total	797	2700	3.39	9127	2823	1187	855	0	4865		
1979 & Special	343	1297	3.78	757	1233	508	389	0	2130	2750(dumped some)	
<u>1980</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>1621</u>	<u>5.73</u>	<u>10704</u>	<u>1606</u>	<u>838</u>	<u>598</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3042</u>	2500(dumped some)	3200(dumped some)
Total	626	2918	4.66	11461	2839	1346	987	0	5172		
1981 & Special	381	2602	7.19	1732	2522	975	875	25	4397	2500(dumped some)	
<u>1982 &amp; Special</u>	<u>272</u>	<u>1786</u>	<u>6.57</u>	<u>11680</u>	<u>1543</u>	<u>667</u>	<u>443</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>2675</u>	2500(dumped some)	3200(dumped some)
Total	653	4388	6.73	13412	4065	1642	1318	46	7072		
1983	375	2905	7.7	2151	2506	896	506	14	3922	2400(dumped some)	
<u>1984</u>	<u>282</u>	<u>2409</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>12731</u>	<u>2225</u>	<u>789</u>	<u>590</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3612</u>	2400(dumped some)	3200(sold out with Supp Fall '85)
Total	657	5314	8.08	14882	4731	1685	1096	22	7534		
1985 & Special	327	2993	9.2	2093	2747	1061	719	16	4543	2400(dumped some)	
<u>1986 &amp; Special</u>	<u>169</u>	<u>1508</u>	<u>8.9</u>	<u>12421</u>	<u>1108</u>	<u>852</u>	<u>406</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>2412</u>	2400(dumped some)	3500(sold out 12/86)
Total	496	4501	9.07	14514	3855	1914	1125	62	6955		
1987 & Special	410	3960	9.7	2517	3466	1619	1017	65	6167	2400(dumped some)	
<u>1988</u>	<u>315</u>	<u>2241</u>	<u>7.1</u>	<u>13050</u>	<u>2061</u>	<u>464</u>	<u>241</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>2773</u>	2400(all but 10 sold)	3800(sold out 4/89)
Total	725	6201	8.4	15567	5527	2083	1258	72	8940		
1989 & Special	358	3873	10.8	2781	3246	1762	794	31	5833	2600 (sold out 8/89)	
<u>1990</u>	<u>256</u>	<u>2813</u>	<u>10.9</u>	<u>13984</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1322</u>	<u>875</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>4096</u>	2900	4300 ordered
Total	614	6686	10.9	16765	5140	3084	1669	36	9929		

\* Special Session not included.

\*\* Not available yet.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

BILL DRAFTING OPERATIONS

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>Drafting Files Opened</u>	<u>Drafting Files Introduced</u>	<u>Percent</u>	<u>Amendment Drafts</u>	<u>Total Bill Introductions</u>	<u>Bill Comparisons</u>	<u>Conference Committee Reports(Acted On)</u>	<u>Misc. Documents Including Appropriations</u>
1975	3683	*	*	*	3643	*	*	*
<u>1976</u>	<u>1541</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1654</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	5224	2645	51%	559	5297	*	*	*
1977	3301	*	*	388	3268	197	*	*
<u>1978</u>	<u>1418</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>1680</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>*</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	4719	3049	65%	*	4948	368	*	*
1979 & Special	3275	2001	61%	425	3252	138	49	*
<u>1980</u>	<u>1571</u>	<u>974</u>	<u>62%</u>	<u>454</u>	<u>1692</u>	<u>180</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	4846	2975	61%	879	4944	318	104	*
1981 & Special	2936	1835	63%	405	3045	227	72	*
<u>1982 &amp; Special</u>	<u>1562</u>	<u>876</u>	<u>56%</u>	<u>404</u>	<u>1484</u>	<u>159</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>*</u>
Total	4498	2711	60%	809	4529	386	134	*
1983	2607	1594	61%	566	2690	225	92	*
<u>1984</u>	<u>1651</u>	<u>1088</u>	<u>66%</u>	<u>546</u>	<u>1803</u>	<u>212</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>172</u>
Total	4258	2682	63%	1112	4493	437	132	*
1985 & Special	3170	1959	62%	1109	3308	256	79 (61)	389
<u>1986 &amp; Special</u>	<u>1536</u>	<u>931</u>	<u>61%</u>	<u>710</u>	<u>1647</u>	<u>181</u>	<u>58 (31)</u>	<u>112</u>
Totals	4706	2890	61%	1819	4955	437	137 (92)	501
1987 & Special	3052	1902	62%	1020	3253	246	67 (62)	161
<u>1988</u>	<u>2115</u>	<u>1258</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>1044</u>	<u>2174</u>	<u>274</u>	<u>139 (85)</u>	<u>193</u>
Totals	5167	3160	61%	2064	5427	520	206(147)	354
1989	3356	1783	53%	1268	3444	234	152 (86)	195
<u>1990</u>	<u>2181</u>	<u>1187</u>	<u>54%</u>	<u>1506</u>	<u>2031</u>	<u>224</u>	<u>137 (80)</u>	<u>389</u>
Totals	5537	2970	54%	2774	5475	458	289 (116)	584

\* Statistics not available

\*\* Includes Special Session 1989 numbers.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ENGROSSING AND ENROLLING OPERATIONS

Session Year	Engrossed House Bills	Engrossed Senate Bills	Unofficial House Engrossments	Unofficial Senate Engrossments	Total Engrossments	House Enrollments	Senate Enrollments	Total Enrollments	Vetoed*	Senate & House Resolutions Enrolled
1975	763	648	2	4	1417	257	180	437	1	1
<u>1976</u>	<u>475</u>	<u>432</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>986</u>	<u>174</u>	<u>176</u>	<u>350</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	1238	1080	75	10	2403	431	356	787	5	3
1977	608	716	67	6	1397	211	244	455	0	1
<u>1978</u>	<u>544</u>	<u>431</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>1048</u>	<u>242</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>342</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	1152	1147	125	21	2445	453	344	797	0	3
1979 & Spec.	494	584	65	7	1150	195	153	348	5	3
<u>1980</u>	<u>381</u>	<u>511</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>949</u>	<u>139</u>	<u>144</u>	<u>283</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0</u>
Total	875	1095	118	11	2099	334	297	631	10	3
1981 & Spec.	408	640	26	14	1088	207	199	406	8	4
<u>1982 &amp; Spec.</u>	<u>461</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>932</u>	<u>161</u>	<u>125</u>	<u>286</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	869	1075	50	26	2020	368	324	692	18	9
1983	626	635	40	18	1319	205	182	387	1	11
<u>1984</u>	<u>513</u>	<u>481</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>1029</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>136</u>	<u>298</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>11</u>
Total	1139	1116	66	27	2348	367	318	685	6	22
1985 & Spec.	607	740	35	31	1413	163	172	335	1	7
<u>1986 &amp; Spec.</u>	<u>377</u>	<u>431</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>841</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>83</u>	<u>172</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>
Total	984	1171	50	49	2254	252	255	507	2	9
1987 & Spec.	858	801	41	40	1740	262	158	420	0	10
<u>1988</u>	<u>611</u>	<u>615</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>1274</u>	<u>171</u>	<u>153</u>	<u>324</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
Total	1469	1416	67	62	3014	433	311	744	3	16
1989 & Spec.	766	776	52	33	1627	225	139	362	3	6
<u>1990</u>	<u>413</u>	<u>549</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>1014</u>	<u>93</u>	<u>164</u>	<u>257</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	1179	1325	79	58	2641	318	302	619	4	7

\*Does not include item vetoes.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
 YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - DRAFTING AND FORM APPROVAL OF RULES

	(1) New Drafting Files	(2) Rough Drafts Prepared	(3) Preliminary Drafts Prepared	(4) Final Proposed Rule Drafts Approved	(5) Stripped Proposed Rules	(6) Modif- ications	(7) Final Adopted Rules	(8) Notice of Adoption	(9) Stripped Adopted	(10) Total (2)to(9)	(11) Average Drafts Per File
FY 1982	195	175	104	201	82	109	122	76	87	956	4.9
FY 1983	140	140	154	171	75	73	117	84	78	892	6.4
FY 1984	185	185	205	241	138	95	135	103	111	1213	6.6
FY 1985	239	240	318	283	179	169	173	151	160	1673	7.0
FY 1986	180	242	176	192	186	85	182	151	128	1342	7.5
FY 1987	152	245	173	164	118	90	120	112	126	1148	7.6
FY 1988	206	324	278	244	182	103	148	135	134	1548	8.2
FY 1989	177	390	285	230	150	147	177	150	139	1668	8.9
FY 1990	207	417	332	252	181	143	166	155	136	1782	9.0

6

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
 YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES--SOURCE AND TYPE OF RULE DRAFTING

	Agencies Served	Department-Level Agencies	Smaller Agencies	Original Drafts by Revisor	Agency Drafts Needing Few Changes	Agency Drafts Needing Many Changes
FY 1982	46	13	33	1	15	65
FY 1983	40	16	24	0	35	105
FY 1984	39	17	22	0	40	145
FY 1985	41	17	24	0	45	194
FY 1986	42	16	26	0	45	135
FY 1987	44	20	24	0	30	122
FY 1988	45	20	25	0	42	164
FY 1989	45	20	25	1	26	151
FY 1990	45	20	25	0	30	177

10

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

COMMITTEE REPORTS\*

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>House Committee Reports</u>
1983	445
<u>1984</u>	<u>371</u>
Total	816
1985	478
<u>1986</u>	<u>280</u>
Total	758
1987	606
<u>1988</u>	<u>450</u>
Total	1056
1989 & Special	557
<u>1990</u>	<u>333</u>
Total	890

\*The revisor did not draft committee reports before 1983 and now only does it for the House. Senate reports are prepared by Senate engrossing staff.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES  
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

MINNESOTA RULES EDITORIAL OPERATIONS

	Edition	Pages	Parts Amended	New	Repealed	Renumbered	Total Rule Parts Affected	Press Run(Sold)
	Prior to 8/1/83	1983	8787	-	-	-	-	1000 (480)
	8/1/83 to 8/31/84	1984 Supplement	1107	487	906	457	-	1850 1000 (650)
	9/1/84 to 4/8/85	1985	9661	414	547	240	-	1201
	4/9/85 to 12/2/85	1986 Supplement No. 1	843	257	564	209	18	1048
12	4/9/85 to 7/28/86	1986 Supplement No. 2 (cumulative)	1404	564	1039	458	38	2099 (cumulative)
	4/9/85 to 3/30/87	1987 (cumulative)	10481	919	1547	891	96	3453 (cumulative) 1000 (800)
	3/31/87 to 11/30/87	1988 Supplement No. 1	976	271	518	86	-	875
	3/31/87 to 8/8/88	1988 Supplement No. 2	1398	567	1096	365	10	2038 (cumulative)
	3/31/87 to 4/3/89	1989	11460	1703	1803	875	714	5075 (cumulative) 1100(Sold out 7/90)
	4/4/89 to 12/4/89	1990 Supplement No. 1	782	646	698	314	22	1680 1100
	12/5/89 to 8/13/90	1990 Supplement No. 2 (not completed yet)						

\*As of August 31, 1989.

Function:

- drafting bills, resolutions, and amendments for the members of the Legislature, the heads of departments, and the Governor.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.03, subdivision 2.

Performance:

The office prepared 2181 bills and resolutions for the 1990 session of the Legislature. That number compares with 2083 in 1988. The higher number continues an upward trend of the last few years.

The office prepared 1506 amendments during the year. This, also, continues the upward trend. Of that number, 1288 were drafted for the House and 218 for the Senate. The main causes for the difference are still that the office provides staff on the House floor but not the Senate, and that the office is close to representatives' offices and House committee rooms.

Virtually all drafts were completed within the time asked by the requester. All drafting files are reviewed to ensure that prompt delivery is the normal procedure.

Two lawyers were available on the floor of the House at all times during its meetings to draft amendments and provide other legal services. A drafting assistant from the Revisor's staff and the Chief Clerk's secretary provided typed amendments for the House floor. When there was a large volume of floor amendments, a second Revisor's drafting assistant was added. Because of the House remodeling, terminals for keyboarding were available where the attorneys were located next to the House chambers rather than on the third floor. This made preparation of the amendments much faster.

Quality controls for all drafting include review by attorneys, clerical review, the use of specially adapted computer programs, the text editing system itself, regular review of all processes, and formal and informal instruction of all staff in quality control, including style and form standards.

Problems:

The number of congratulatory resolutions continues to balloon. Procedures have been devised to prepare them quickly. However, during some periods of the session, juggling the resolutions with substantive work continues to be

difficult. Some members began requesting individually crafted resolutions for all members of an athletic team rather than one resolution for the whole team. For large teams, such as a football team, this could take a very long time for one staff member to complete. At the Revisor's request, the Speaker asked members not to request such work during the legislative session.

During the year, the Revisor proposed a series of changes to bill form. The changes were significant and are still under review. As a result, no substantive changes in bill form for the 1991 session are likely.

Function:

- examine bills and endorse approval of both form and compliance with joint rules and House rules.

Source of Mandate: House Rule 5.1.

Performance:

Each bill prepared for introduction in the House of Representatives (that, in practice, means all bills since bills drafted for a senator have both House and Senate copies) was checked for compliance with legislative rules. This function was continued without difficulty as an integral part of the regular bill drafting procedure.

Problems:

None

Function:

- preparing House committee reports.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6 (requested by the speaker and chief clerk).

Performance:

There were 333 House committee reports prepared in 1990 compared with 450 reports in the 1988 regular session, which is a decrease of 117. This number is still higher than the number of reports that were prepared four years ago.

Problems:

None

Function:

- drafting administrative rules upon the request of an agency.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 14.07, subdivision 1, clause (f).

Performance:

During fiscal year 1990, the office handled 207 new sets of rules for form approval or drafting assistance. This figure is up from the 141 sets prepared in fiscal year 1983 and down from the 239 sets in fiscal year 1985, the year before billing began.

Quality controls for rule drafting include review by the drafting attorneys and the assistant deputy revisor for rules, clerical review, the use of specifically adapted computer programs, the text editing system itself, regular review of all processes, and formal and informal instruction of all staff in quality control, including style and form standards.

The average number of drafts per file continued its uninterrupted upward trend from 4.9 per file in fiscal year 1982 to 9.0 per file in fiscal year 1990. The number per file increased from 8.9 in fiscal year 1989 to 9.0 this year. When the number of documents produced per file is considered along with the increase in the number of files, the growth in the rules work is very significant.

Problems:

The assignment of rule drafting files to the twelve attorneys in the Revisor's Office is based on the same specialty areas used for bill drafts. However, certain agencies have many rule requests each year and others have none. As a result, two of the twelve attorneys do more than half of all rule files and five of the attorneys do eighty-seven percent of all files. The imbalance in the workload clearly requires change.

Function:

- compiling and publishing the Laws of Minnesota, Minnesota Statutes, and Minnesota Statutes Supplement together with their indexes and finding aids.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, sections 3C.06, 3C.08, and 3C.09.

Performance:

Laws of Minnesota 1990 was delivered on June 21, 1990, a little less than 60 days after adjournment of the 1990 legislative session. The publication includes the 1989 special session laws. 4529 statutory sections were affected in 258 chapters in this combined volume. If the 900 sections of the water bill are excluded from the numbers, then the sections affected are about 3600. This is still a remarkable jump from the 2773 sections affected in 315 chapters in the 1988 edition. As in 1988, the set is bound in two volumes, although the 1990 set is substantially larger. The figures show a remarkable growth in the size of the bills passed and the number of sections affected over the 1988 session.

Work is progressing on schedule for the 1990 statutes. A large number of complex revisor instructions will contribute to the already extensive "normal" revision to the statutes done by enactment of the session laws.

The press runs on both session laws and statutes were further increased this year in response to the continuing increase in sales. The press runs show increases of 500 sets for the session laws and 800 sets for the statutes over the last three editions.

Minnesota Statutes 1990 will again be made available on CD-ROM. This pilot project, begun in 1988, has shown favorable response. While sales of the 1988-89 disks were modest, the 1990 disks will be available about the same time as the printed books and so will be much more marketable.

During the year, we began examining the opportunities for more attorneys to take part in editorial decisions. This avenue seems useful from a variety of standpoints and is being actively pursued.

Problems:

The unexpected growth in demand of our publications continues to make projecting optimum press runs difficult. The early sell-out of 1989 Laws, despite its increased press run, made it necessary to print additional sets after the full press run. This, along with the special session activity of September 1989, caused unexpected printing expenditures. All additional money spent will be recovered through sales of the books.

The bulk of material passed continues to frustrate scheduled delivery times. While all internal deadlines are met, the binding of multiple volumes adds to an already tight schedule.

---

Function:

- publish rules adopted by the Minnesota Supreme Court and other courts.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.08, subdivision 1.

Performance:

Work on the 1989 pocket part supplement of the court rule volume was completed on schedule.

Work on updating rules for the 1990 edition of the court rule volume is progressing on schedule. The 1990 edition of the court rule volume will contain amendments to the Rules of Criminal Procedure, Rules of Evidence, and Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court.

We currently have Minnesota Statutes on optical compact discs (CD-ROM). The CD technology enables anyone with an IBM compatible PC to access the text of Minnesota Statutes. In order to make court rules also accessible by use of CD technology, we approached Chief Justice Popovich of the Supreme Court with a request that a change in the format of the court rules be considered in 1989. We also presented a court rule renumbering proposal to a committee of the Minnesota State Bar Association in the fall of 1989.

In early 1990, the Minnesota State Bar Association Executive Committee voted to recommend that the Supreme Court adopt the Revisor's renumbering on the basis that the proposed numbering system would provide a service to legal profession by facilitating computerized research.

In June 1990, we submitted a proposal to the Supreme Court to assist them in putting the court rules in a uniform format. If the proposed numbering system is adopted by the Supreme Court and the rules made accessible by use of CD-ROM and online, the court system in Minnesota will have taken an important step in placing itself in the forefront of state courts in using the latest electronic technologies to administer the courts.

If the renumbering proposal is adopted by the Supreme Court, we would undertake renumbering the court rules as a joint project of the Supreme Court and the Revisor's office.

Problems:

The editorial cut-off date for the 1990 edition of the court rule volume is earlier again this year because our publication deadlines occur earlier. This may cause some problems, especially with sentencing guideline changes, because the courts and other rule promulgating bodies have a tendency to make court rule changes in the summer.

---

Function:

- compiling and publishing Minnesota Rules and Minnesota Rules Supplement together with an index and finding aids.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 14.47.

Performance:

The first supplement to Minnesota Rules 1989 was delivered in March of this year, well ahead of planned delivery. A second supplement is currently in progress and on schedule.

Sales of the 1989 set and its supplements have risen as expected over the 1987 edition.

The office is looking at ways to further increase the distribution of the rule publications. If the CD-ROM project for the statutes is successful, we will make Rules available in CD-ROM format as well.

Problems:

The office needs to enhance the timeliness of the rule publications given the dynamics of the rulemaking process. Of particular concern is the scheduling of the work with our legislative and indexing workloads if we publish more frequently.

Function:

- preparation and printing of pamphlets containing extracts from Minnesota Statutes and Minnesota Rules.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.11, subdivision 2.

Performance:

There were 43 requests for extracts from Minnesota Statutes in 1990. This is an increase from 1989 and all were produced from the statutory data base. Twenty-seven requests contained fewer than 100 pages, ten were between 100 and 500 pages, five between 500 and 1000 and one over 1000. Most requests were from documents as well as state agencies, boards, and private associations.

There were 39 requests for extracts from Minnesota Rules. This is equal to the number of requests from the previous year. Thirty of the requests were for extracts of less than 100 pages, six were between 100 and 500 pages, two were between 500 and 1000 pages, and one was over 1000.

Changes were made in the extract program to accommodate Rules extracts. The new version of the program stops and allows us to insert blank space for forms, charts, maps, etc.

Problems:

Statutes: No particular problems were encountered. A new program was established for more composition options to meet the needs of the requester. This includes chapter analysis, length of text on page and spacing, pagination, range or selected sections, running head, etc. Again this year, we provided printouts of various chapters for drafting purposes using the extract program.

Rules: There were no significant problems. The new program was very helpful in speeding up the process.

Function:

- accumulating data on the operation and effect of laws in Minnesota and other states.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 2.

Performance:

---

This mandate is fulfilled by the Revisor's active encouragement of the staff to request acquisition of specialized legal treatises relating to their assigned bill drafting subject areas. Several attorneys have acquired collections that they actively use in drafting. Acquisitions to these collections were made on a regular basis.

Problems:

None

Function:

- prepare and have available for use indexes of the permanent and general laws and all permanent local laws of this state.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.08, subdivision 1.

Performance:

The 1989 Statutes Supplement index was completed by the mid-July 1989 deadline. An index was prepared for both the Laws and the Statutes Supplement publications for the 1989 First Special Session. The Laws 1990 index was completed in a timely manner. At the time of this report, work is progressing on the index to 1990 Statutes.

The Statutes reindexing project that we started in 1988 is progressing. All attorneys in the office have been trained to work on the project. They will work during the 1990 and 1991 interims. In addition to the four contract indexers already working on the project, several more will be hired for fiscal year 1991. We hope to reach our goal of completing the work for the 1992 edition of Statutes.

Problems:

The reindexing project is in addition to the usual workload of our office. All staff will be required to give extra effort to meet the 1992 goal.

Function:

- preparing and publishing a bill drafting manual.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.03, subdivision 4.

Performance:

Work on the Revisor's Manual was postponed in the hope that the Legislature would address a proposal by the Revisor for major changes in bill form. The proposal was extensive and is still under review. Consequently, the approach to be taken now will be to update the existing manual assuming that there will be no major changes in bill form for at least the next session.

Problems:

The latest edition of the Revisor's Manual has been out of print for about a year. Some photocopies were prepared for necessary work. The fact that the manual is both out of date and out of print has caused a variety of nuisance problems.

It is contemplated that the manual will be revised and republished in 1991.

Function:

- preparing and publishing a rule drafting manual.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 14.07, subdivision 1, clause (2).

Performance:

A new edition of the rule drafting manual has been prepared and composed on the office's desktop publishing system. It will be ready for the printer as soon as it has been indexed. The desktop publishing system allows us to do our own composition for short publications such as the manual and to produce new editions whenever changes in the law require them.

Problems:

None

Function:

- engrossing and enrolling bills for the Senate and House.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 5; Joint Rules 2.07.

Performance:

In the 1990 regular session, 1014 engrossments were completed including 52 unofficial engrossments requested by the desks. 440 engrossments were done for the House. This is a decrease of 197 from the 1988 regular session. 574 engrossments were done for the Senate. This is a decrease of 63 from the 1988 regular session.

In this session, 257 enrollments were completed. This figure includes one resolution. This figure represents a decrease of 67 from the 1988 regular session.

This year a two-step checking procedure was instituted for the attorney staff. This procedure sped up turnaround time in sending engrossments back to the appropriate desks.

Problems:

No significant problems were encountered.

Function:

- examining all administrative rules and approving or rejecting their form.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 14.07, subdivision 2.

Performance:

In fiscal year 1990, no final proposed rules or final adopted rules were disapproved. The drastic step of disapproving a rule has not been necessary since 1982, the first year the Revisor was involved in rulemaking. Agencies are generally comfortable allowing the Revisor to make changes considered appropriate to avoid disapproval. The office's method of billing is designed to encourage agencies to use available services. The office's production statistics for fiscal year 1990 confirm that agencies are using all services and allowing the office to revise drafts before they are finalized. Consequently, there is no need to refuse to approve these drafts when they are finalized.

Problems:

None

Function:

- preparing a biennial report on Supreme Court opinions that criticized statutes or found them to be unconstitutional.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 3.

Performance:

~~This report is only prepared every other year in November of even-numbered years. As a result, the report was not worked on during the period covered by this report.~~

Problems:

None

Function:

- serve as one of the four state commissioners on the Uniform Laws Commission.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3.251.

Performance:

Uniform Laws Commission drafts were reviewed throughout the year. Participation in conference meetings and committees was provided. The 1990 conference will consider acts relating to the commercial code, defamation, judgments, probate, child support, mineral development and controlled substances, among others.

Problems:

None

Function:

- preparing and submitting to the Legislature bills that clarify existing statutes.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 4.

Performance:

A revisor's bill to clarify, modernize, and simplify the text of two chapters of Minnesota Statutes dealing with town government was passed. Laws 1990, chapter 401.

A revisor's bill to correct obsolete and redundant language, erroneous and obsolete references and conflicting amendments was passed. Laws 1990, chapter 406.

A bill to correct errors that occurred during the session in other bills was passed. Laws 1990, chapter 612.

Problems:

Bills to correct errors that have occurred during the session have presented various difficulties from year to year. Although the revisor's office drafts the material in the bill, the office does not control what is included. A thorough method has been developed to assure that each interested member approves the inclusion of each item. Various courses of legislative procedure have been followed at several sessions but none seems to work more than two years running. In 1990 the bill went smoothly, however.

Function:

- preparing bill comparison reports for the Secretary of the Senate and Chief Clerk of the House.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by Secretary of the Senate and Chief Clerk of the House).

---

Performance:

During 1990, we completed 224 comparison reports. We prepared 70 for the Senate, 146 for the House, and eight appropriations comparisons.

All deck and supervisory staff were involved in preparing the comparisons with supervisors checking them. The Senate has a short form while the House has a detailed report showing the differences in language in each companion bill.

Problems:

The same problem occurs with House comparisons as in past years. They are time-consuming to prepare. For comparisons with many detailed differences, an expanded use of the short form would be helpful.

A second suggestion for comparisons for the House is to compare only the body. There does not seem to be a practical or legal necessity to report on differences in bill titles when the body is identical.

Criteria need to be set up for what needs to be included when comparing companion bills.

Function:

- preparing special comparisons of appropriations bills for use by appropriations conference committees to arrive at a compromise on major bills.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by staff of House appropriations committee and Senate finance committee).

---

Performance:

The higher education, state departments, building, and semistate appropriation conferees used a side-by-side comparison for some or all of their bills. The human service, state departments, building, and education aids conferees used an end-over-end comparison that had been copied into the computer for some or all of their bills.

Problems:

The matter of which kind of comparison to use is one of preference of the conferees and staff. It is important to make sure, in advance of the conference, which kind of comparison is preferred. The manual preparation of the side-by-side comparison is very time consuming. Computer assistance would speed up preparation, though there are significant technical hurdles to clear before computer assistance will be available.

Function:

- developing and maintaining a computer for use by the Revisor of Statutes office for the production of legislative documents.

Source of Mandate: None, but the use of the computer system is the most efficient way to do work otherwise mandated.

Performance:

---

Highlights of work done during the year:

1. Improved connection to MLIS for the House and Senate LAN's by installing NCR Comten hardware and software.
2. The indexing system for the reindexing project was extended.
3. A new CPU and additional disk storage were installed.
4. Security software (VMSecure) was implemented
5. A help desk was implemented consolidating users' questions and problems, facilitating problem tracking, and requiring users to know only one help source.
6. A problem tracking facility was installed.
7. "DO EXEC's" continue to be extended. "DO EXEC's" use a high-level language to process TE data, allowing better utilization of staff time to meet user requests.
8. System accounting (VMAccount) was installed which allows us to monitor resources and software functions and uses for planning and billing if necessary.
9. LU6.2 code was added to TE which is the first step in allowing program to program communication between different CPU's. (Mainframe to PC or mainframe to mainframe.)
10. The ability to treat TE data from multiple sources as one logical document for printing or displaying.
11. The IBM PROP (programmable operator) feature was installed. This greatly reduces system message traffic and highlights messages that really require operator attention.
12. Work began on a rule tracking system.
13. X Windows and UNIX technology is being evaluated.

Problems:

Our system is beginning to age. With new and flexible technology available, we are exploring options to renovate our hardware and software. It will require a major effort to develop and implement new systems while maintaining the current system. Users will continue to want additional applications and enhancements to existing applications, and a thorough evaluation based on need and time constraints will be critical. Staff time spent on new applications and improving old applications will be time not spent on the renovation.

---

Function:

- upon request, assisting Senate and House staff in preparing new computer systems for their use.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by Senate and House staff).

Performance:

1. Improved connection to MLIS and Intertech for the House and Senate LAN's by installing NCR Comten hardware and software.
2. A new CPU and additional disk storage were installed.
3. Approximately 100 new Senate, House, and Executive branch logon IDs were added.
4. A help desk was implemented consolidating users' problems and questions.
5. "DO EXEC's" continue to be extended. "DO EXEC's" use a high-level language to process TE data, allowing better utilization of staff time to meet user requests.

Problems:

The full implementation of the NCR Comten has been delayed because of nondelivery of software by a subcontracting vendor. A plan and time frame has been agreed on to resolve the problems.

The growing number of users will require additional communications hardware and support. An expansion and elimination of defects in the computer room is under way. The expanded computer staff has moved to 525 Park.

Training of users has become very important. Users need to know about the data they are viewing (MLIS users), how to manipulate data (TE editing users), and how to troubleshoot their connections.

Function:

- obtaining and maintaining computer terminals, printers, and other equipment for use by the Revisor's office and other legislative agencies for the production of legislative documents.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by Senate and House staff).

---

Performance:

The following equipment was added:

- . One 3274 control unit - (used)
- . One 3880 disk unit - (used)
- . Six 3179 terminals - (used)
- . One 4381 CPU - (used)
- . One 64 MB solid state disk
- . One NCR Comten communications hardware and software
- . Three laser printers

The following equipment was sold for salvage:

- . One 3705 communications controller
- . One 4341 CPU

The following staff was added:

- . One programmer/analyst
- . One help desk specialist/trainer

Problems:

Because of promises made and not delivered by a subcontracting software vendor, the full implementation of the NCR communications for the House and Senate LAN's has been delayed. A plan and time frame have been agreed on to resolve the problems.

The growing number of outside users will require additional communications hardware and support. The current facilities for both hardware and staff have been outgrown. The computer room is in the process of being expanded and defects eliminated. The computer staff has moved to 525 Park.

Additionally, a new generation of hardware and software is being explored to continue along the path of providing users with the best resources for their work.

Function:

- drafting conference committee reports.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature.

Performance:

During 1990, the office prepared 80 conference committee reports that were returned to the desks. There were 35 House conference committee reports and 45 for the Senate. When alternative and unofficial versions of reports are added, the total is considerably higher: it reaches 137. Of the 137, 57 reports were done for the House and 80 for the Senate.

Problems:

There is the continued problem of how quickly these reports must be done. There is not proper time allowed to check references, titles, and retrieval, especially on documents originating outside our office. Because of the severe time constraints in producing these documents, the growing number of multiple versions requested for conference committee reports is of continuing concern. Some reports had six versions prepared.

A continuing problem is the sending of a copy of the conference committee report to the House or Senate for duplicating before the signed report is returned to our office. There is confusion about when advance duplicating is to be done and why it is necessary.

Function:

- providing legal assistance to the Legislative Commission to Review Administrative Rules.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6; custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by the LCRAR).

Performance:

The assistant deputy revisor for rules was assigned as counsel for the LCRAR. This position was in addition to this person's other drafting duties. At the request of counsel, other attorneys in the office provide advice on specific issues related to their drafting specialties.

Counsel's duties include attending all commission hearings, reviewing preliminary assessments, staff reports, and other documents issued by the commission, and providing legal advice to staff and commission members as requested.

Problems:

None

Function:

- conducting computer searches for legislative staff and executive agency clients.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1990, section 3C.04, subdivision 6 (individual research requests by legislative and outside staff of a system developed by us for drafting and editorial purposes.

Performance:

During 1990, more individuals and agencies have learned to utilize the search programs. Our staff has used it in drafting and editing. The majority of our searches were for legislators and agencies looking for particular phrases, but some were also done for sources outside of government. We had 58 requests for searches.

As expected, the number of requests has decreased in the past year. The two most common requests are to find cross-references and definitions. We also have done several searches to make sure a term no longer exists. We have expanded the search capacity to include:

SRCH - search any data base for one word;

MTSH - search any data base for up to 200 individual words;

CTSH - search any data base with words in relationship, within one line of each other (almost obsolete);

SRCHST - search all of statutes for a phrase; and

MPSRCH, search any data base for multiple phrases or words. With the use of these searches, we have been able to help improve the drafting and editing of statutory material.

Problems:

None

Function:

- furnishing public data to outside sources requesting copies.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes, chapter 13 (Government Data Practices Act).

Performance:

Two different companies have contacted the Revisor asking for statutory and rule data for publishing a CD-ROM of the data. Discussions are under way on how to do this and what the compensation would be. One of the companies proposes to publish a MAC version of a CD-ROM. (The existing Revisor-published CD-ROM is IBM compatible.)

Another company contacted the Revisor wanting to publish Statutes on floppy disk using data compression technology. discussions are under way on this as well.

Still another company, from California, contacted the Revisor asking for legislative data to be used in a national on-line legislative information system. They have been provided with a sample tape. Discussions are also under way with them on charges.

The Revisor has worked with Intertech to help them develop an on-line legislative information system for use by state agencies and possibly dial-up by the public. A demonstration system is available now and a fully developed system should be ready for the next session.

Problems:

None

