COMMITTEE REPORT

MINNESOTA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SELECT COMMITTEE ON WASTE AND MISMANAGEMENT

Randy C. Kelly, Chairman

December 11, 1980

INTRODUCTION

In August 1980, Speaker Fred Norton appointed the following representatives to a House Select Committee on Waste and Mismanagement:

Rep. Randy C. Kelly, Chairman
Rep. Lona Minne
Rep. Steve Novak
Rep. Tom Berkelman
Rep. Jim Evans
Rep. Mary Forsythe
Rep. Dick Kaley

The Committee was formed for several reasons. First, budget deficits of the Quie Administration were announced focusing attention on possible program cuts and renewing interest in reducing waste and mismanagement. Second, there was interest in reviewing the implementation of cost savings recommendations made in December 1978 by the Task Force on Waste and Mismanagement directed by Robert E. Goff. This Task Force was created in 1977 by the Legislature at the request of Governor Perpich and recommended cost savings measures for selected agency operating budgets.

The first action of the Committee was to hold a joint meeting on August 26, 1980 with the Waste and Mismanagement Subcommittee of the Senate Governmental Operations Committee. The purpose of the meeting was to review past and current efforts to reduce waste and mismanagement in state agencies. Senate staff member, Diane Hendrickson, described the various recommendations in the 1978 Task Force report. Senate staff member, Brad Lundell presented an analysis of state expenditures from 1978 to 1980. Robert Renner of the Governor's staff and Jim Hiniker, Commissioner of Administration, then discussed the implementation status of Task Force recommendations as well as budget policy for FY 1982.

At the end of the meeting, the Chairmen announced the issue areas assigned to each committee. The House Committee chose to look at unclassified personnel, problems identified at the Information Services Bureau (ISB), space allocation policies for state agencies and the state printing and duplicating operation. The issues were assigned so as to avoid duplication of effort and it was agreed that each committee would share their findings with the other by the beginning of the 1981 Legislative Session.

ISSUE AREAS

I. UNCLASSIFIED PERSONNEL

At the present time, positions designated within the unclassified service include elected officials and some of their staff, legislative employees, some Legislative Audit Commission employees, some state university and community college employees, temporary vehicle license staff in the Department of Public Safety, some managerial employees in agencies, some court employees, officers and enlisted persons in the National Guard, members of the highway patrol, seasonal help of the Department of Revenue, permanent staff of the Governor's House, student workers and some staff of the Department of Employee Relations (MS Chapter 43.09, Subd. 1 and 2). Certain executive branch positions such as department heads are specifically authorized by statute. In addition, M.S. Chapter 43.09, Subd. 2a gives the Governor the authority to approve 107 additional unclassified policy making positions. Finally, rule 2 MCAR 2.010 (Rule 10) allows the Commissioner of the Department of Employee Relations to appoint temporary unclassified positions for up to three years.

No action was taken on this topic as it was being studied by other Legislative Committees. The Legislative Commission on Employee Relations, created in 1979, is undertaking a major review of the civil service laws including unclassified personnel. The Commission is expected to address such relevant issues as: a rationale for the role of the unclassified service, the diminishing distinction between some classified and unclassified positions, whether Rule 10 should be more explicit, whether the many laws designating department head and other high level positions as unclassified should be revised and whether MS Chapter 43.09, Subd. 2a should be revised. Also, a bipartisan subcommittee of the House Rules Committee with representation from each caucus steering committee has initiated a long range compensation and classification study of partisan and nonpartisan employees of the House of Representatives. Commissions under the purview of the LCC are exploring the possibility of joining this effort. Some senators have expressed interest in coordinating the House study with the current personnel system in the Senate.

II. INFORMATION SERVICES BUREAU (ISB)

The Commissioner of Administration has the statutory authority (M.S. 16.90 - 16.96) to operate and regulate the computer services of state government agencies. The law requires the commissioner to develop and operate state data security systems, develop and present a master plan for information systems at the beginning of each regular session, establish standards for information systems, maintain a library of systems and programs developed, and administer communications for the state information system. In addition, the state agencies must submit programs and plans for computer efforts to the Commissioner for review and either approval, modification or rejection.

The ISB is one of the largest computer operations in Minnesota comparable in size to the one at 3M or the two major bank holding companies in the state. ISB operates with an authorized staff complement of 381 (including 72 intermittent data entry positions) and a bienniel budget of $27,000,000.

In response to criticism of ISB by users and others, the Legislative Audit Commission directed the Program Evaluation Division to conduct a study.

The final report, Evaluation of the Information Services Bureau, was completed March 31, 1980 and served as a focal point for the effort of the Committee.

Actions taken:

1. On September 16, 1980 the House Committee on Waste and Mis-Management met jointly with the House Task Force on Telecommunications and Information chaired by Representative Phyllis Kahn to review the evaluation report. Those testifying included:

   Elliot Long, Study Director, Program Evaluation Division
   James Hiniker, Commissioner of Administration
   Nancy Abraham, Assistant Commissioner of Administration
   Norbert Bohn, Department of Administration
   Val Vikmanis, Department of Finance
   George Winter, Assistant Commissioner of Revenue and Chair of the User Advisory Council
   Barbara Sundquist, Commissioner of Employee Relations

   a. Summary of Report

   The Program Evaluation Division reviewed the performance of the ISB on systems development, production activities and computer operation functions.

   Findings in the systems development area, based on a review of 20 projects, included: only medium sized and small projects were successfully implemented close to time and budget estimates; several projects were abandoned at a cost of $2,000,000; only 1 of 5 large projects was successfully implemented; significant cost overruns occurred in 2/3 of the projects; a cost overrun of 300% ($3,000,000) was incurred for the 4 largest development projects; users were generally dissatisfied and complained about frequent staff turnover, the lack of project status reporting, billing rates for staff services and the length of time to complete projects.

The report identified the major causes of performance problems to be insufficient and inexperienced staff as a result of limited pay and advancement opportunities, rapid rotation of staff assigned to specific projects and lack of communication with users.

Findings in the production activities area (defined as providing users with the output of data processing systems) were based on a 9% sample of 108 jobs and included: problems with operations documentation occurred in 42% of the jobs; problems with inaccuracies occurred in 39% of the jobs; there was a readability problem in 16% of the cases; exceptional handling was required in 20% of the jobs; there were low expectations on the part of users.

Findings in the computer operations area included: additional organizational structure changes were needed; excess capacity may not be adequate; the absence of a short range planning methodology and the lack of adequate staff for this activity; only one position was designated for long range planning; ISB needed data so as to better match equipment with processing needs.

The authors cautioned that the evaluation was conducted prior to the appointment of the present Assistant Commissioner in charge of ISB and noted that changes had been made recently to improve systems development services. Numerous recommendations were made in the Report.

b. <u>Response to the Report</u>

The Commissioner of Administration described improvements made at ISB including the appointment of an

ISB Director as Assistant Commissioner, the addition of new equipment, the reactivation of advisory committees, the dedication of staff to specific types of projects, the use of contracts for programmers and analysts, weekly reports to users on project status, and documentation of all production jobs. A written response to the recommendations made in the report, developed after discussion with ISB personnel and three advisory councils, was made available. The Commissioner noted that many recommendations had been implemented. He also pointed to the success of the major operating systems of ISB which account for 60% of the data in the system (Welfare claims payment, tax system, finance and public payroll, public safety and criminal justice) but were not mentioned in the report.

After discussion with ISB staff and a review of the role of the Department of Finance, the Committee heard presentations by the Chair of the User Advisory Council who was optomistic about the changes at ISB and by the Commissioner of Employee Relations who described efforts to take care of staff compensation and classification problems.

In general, the testimony suggested that improvements had been made and were in progress at ISB.

2. The Department of Administration was requested to prepare a time-table describing the expected improvements at ISB.

The Department submitted a copy of the <u>Data Processing Plan</u> for FY 1981, 1982, and 1983 to the committee. The plan describes the organization of ISB, the users, advisory councils, equipment, fiscal year 1980 accomplishments and a time-table for meeting goals.

Recommendations:

1. The House Appropriations Committee should monitor the progress of the ISB in meeting the goals stated in the Data Processing Plan.

Rationale: It is important to improve the performance of ISB in a timely fashion.

2. The House Appropriations Committee should review the follow-up study which the Program Evaluation Division has scheduled for the fall of 1981.

Rationale: If administrative changes have not been implemented or if problems persist some legislative action might be necessary.

III. SPACE ALLOCATION POLICIES FOR STATE AGENCIES

The Department of Administration is responsible for allocating space to state agencies within state owned buildings and is authorized to lease office/warehouse space and buildings for the use of state government (M.S. 16.012, 16.23 and 16.243). Seven of the 19 staff members in the Real Estate Management Division handle space management activities. Recently, legislators have been concerned about the leasing procedures followed by the Division and the perceived lack of controls regarding agency moves. Typically, the Division has " reacted" to requests made by agencies who wish to move and therefore may have given inadequate consideration to such long range impacts as future costs, agency consolidation, and optimum use of existing spaces.

Because Capitol Complex facilities were fully occupied in the early 1970's and no new construction has been authorized by the

Legislature, space needs of state agencies have been met by a "passive decentralization approach" involving leasing space within the 7 county metro area. Some agencies have been split as a result of this approach e.g. the Department of Revenue occupies state owned space at Centennial Building and leased space in the Nalpak Building, 1276 University Avenue and 395 Robert. As of 1979, state agencies occupied space in 21 state-owned buildings and occupied leased space in 23 separate buildings within the Twin Cities Metro Area. As of December 31, 1979, the state was leasing $5.2 million worth of office space in Ramsey and Hennepin counties alone.

In 1978, the Legislature appropriated funds for a study of state office space needs. While the "passive decentralization" approach had in fact met space needs as the agency's perceived them and had proved to be cost effective in the short run, there was a concern that long range planning had not taken place. The law (Chapter 792, Session Laws of 1978) required the study to include: an analysis of the office space needs of the state for the next 5 years; the comparative economic advantages and disadvantages of the construction, purchase or leasing of needed office space; the economic impact of alternative strategies on the City of St. Paul and Ramsey County; alternative locations and cost estimates for constructing new facilities. The study, Minnesota State Facilities Master Planning Process, was completed by Facility Sciences Corporation (FSC) in 1980. This report served as a focal point for the Committee's effort on space allocation.

Actions taken:

1. On November 18, 1980 the House Committee on Waste and Mismanagement met jointly with members of the Subcommittee on Waste and Mismanagement of the Senate Governmental Operations Committee, members of the State Departments Division of House Appropriations

Committee and members of the State Departments Division of Senate Finance Committee to hear a presentation on the report and to learn about present practices of the Department. Those testifying included:

Jim Steinman, Facility Sciences Corporation
Jim Hiniker, Commissioner of Administration

a. <u>Summary of the Report</u>

The Report described a current space inventory analysis, projections of future space requirements, an adjacency analysis, an analysis of interior environments, a quantitative and qualitative analysis of alternative space acquisition concepts and an economic impact evaluation. Various recommended options were presented. The space inventory findings included: state agencies occupy nearly 2 million net square feet of space in Ramsey and Hennepin counties of which approximately 64% is state owned and 36% is leased; the typical lease was for 1 to 2 years at a cost of \$6.50 to \$7.00 per square foot; 30% of the occupied space is in the St. Paul Central Business District while 53.2% is in the Capitol Complex; the net square feet area occupied by the average employee varies depending on their departmental assignment (examples: Energy Agency - 133 net square feet, Finance - 128 NSF, Corrections - 124 NSF, Commerce - 291 NSF, Human Rights 246 NSF).

Future requirements were based on the assumption that the 4% reduction of state funded positions mandated in the Personnel law of 1979 will be implemented. The report then projected that: staff would grow at annual rates of between 1% to 2½% for 1985 and 1990; each agency's staffing levels would continue to grow at different rates; approximately 337,000 square feet of leased space would be terminated; from 190,000 to 910,000 additional square feet of space would be needed by 1990 depending upon the leases terminated and actual growth rates of staff.

The adjacency analysis, based on agency questionnaires, analyzed: which agencies interact frequently, desire to be in the same building, desire to be in the same complex, or should be in a Capitol Complex location. It showed: that consolidation of agencies to improve overall efficiency should be a high priority; that cost savings due to relocating agencies near one another are not high enough to justify costs to relocate and remodel; that trips between departments are not that frequent.

Interior space improvement findings included: new work station standards should be developed; open space planning and furniture systems can reduce general office space requirements by 10 - 20% in 800,000 of the 1,250,000 net square feet of state owned space; for every $2 invested to improve space utilization, present value life cycle costs will be reduced by $3; a "cost effective renovation" means that less than $1 per net square foot is required for interior modifications for each 1% improvement in space utilization and less than $2,000 per person is required for furniture; it is not cost effective to do large scale remodeling in older leased space.

The analysis of space acquisition alternatives showed that: as of 1980 an annual rent payment should approximate $8.00 per rentable square foot to produce a break even point with new construction; (this figure should be adjusted each year to reflect inflation) locating a facility 3-5 miles northwest of the Capitol would reduce employee commuting time and costs. A life cycle cost analysis determined that the cheapest alternatives were purchase and renovation in downtown St. Paul, leasing and renovating an existing building at $8/square foot in downtown St. Paul, constructing in a suburban location and constructing at Centennial East. When other costs such as employee commuting, interface and parking were included, purchase/renovation and construction were found to be the most cost effective. When other factors such as energy conservation, downtown vitality, government efficiency, flexibility and accessibility were considered, construction was the preferred solution particularly at the Capitol Complex.

Economic impact analysis showed that: state employees are 5% of the central business district total; the state occupies 11% of the downtown office space excluding the Capitol Complex; recommended actions (some lease terminations, purchase in St. Paul, construction in various locations) should result in a modest income loss to St. Paul landlords and increases in retail spending; the city of St. Paul would experience a tax loss if a building was purchased. In general, the impact was deemed insignificant.

The Consultants recommended that the state choose among cost effective space acquisition options only after remodeling existing state owned space and procuring leases for less than the break even rate. Options included: (1) purchase and renovation of a facility in the Capitol Complex or downtown (2) construction of a facility in a close-in suburb (3) construction of a facility at Centennial East (4) construction of a facility between downtown and the Capitol Complex. Costs were estimated to be $50 - 75 million over the next 6 years for remodeling of existing space and acquisition of space through purchase and/or construction.

In general, the report proposed an action oriented long range space planning program for the state as opposed to reactive short range space allocation policies.

b. <u>Response to the Report</u>

The Commissioner of Administration commented that the report was helpful in providing a basis for future planning, providing a space inventory, presenting a basis for looking at projected needs, incorporating the life cycle cost analysis, studying the economic impact on St. Paul and promoting the office systems mode of interior remodeling. However, he noted that the report contained many generalizations and that the data were out of date. Therefore, he felt that each project proposed, whether remodeling or space acquisition, would have to be analyzed in detail. The Commissioner offered a general course of action based on the premise that state employment would not grow as quickly as the report projected and that leasing was cost effective: (1) negotiate lease terms of up to 5 years (2) study the cost benefits of office equipment systems in parts of the Centennial Office Building and request an appropriation to remodel, if warranted (3) consolidate DPW in the Space Center and consolidate DNR and Revenue in the Centennial Building (4) plan to utilize Mechanic Arts and vacant floors of the State Office Building for state agencies if the Legislature does not appropriate remodeling funds. New construction or purchase of space were not recommended.

Some Legislators cautioned that the Commissioner appeared to be advocating continuation of present policies while long range options seemed more appropriate. Discussion also centered on past proposals to remodel the State Office Building and Mechanic Arts.

2. A series of questions dealing with present Department of Administration practices were submitted to the Commissioner to be answered in writing prior to the November 18 meeting. The questions dealt with the process used when agencies request a change in space, the reasons agencies are allowed to move, how space needs are determined, how moves are financed, how many agencies moved in the past few years, the number of private leases processed per year, and remodeling procedures.

Much of the discussion at the meeting related to Department practices. Legislators were concerned that the standards for space allocation in leased space were out of date and therefore did not reflect the guidelines in the FSC Report. While it is the job of the Department to lease space, some agencies have negotiated their own leases in the past. Control over agency moves appears to have been limited to setting the amount of square feet assignable per employee and finding space that the agency could afford to pay for. Agencies have been able to finance moving expenses, higher rents and remodeling from funds in several budget accounts which can be shifted as needed. While the Legislature must approve all agency budgets including expenses related to space, agencies are not required to notify the Legislature during the biennium as these funds are expended for moves. Generally, more controls appeared to be needed to allow for long range planning, optimum use of space, and effective use of funds.

Recommendations:

1. The Legislature should expand the authority and responsibility of the Real Estate Management Division and increase the staff complement. The Division should prepare an annual plan describing proposed remodeling and moving.

Rationale: The State of Minnesota needs a strong, action-oriented program for remodeling, moving and space acquisition activities centralized in one department. Decisions on space management need to be made on a statewide basis.

2. The Legislature should consolidate funding for state agency

renovation, moving and space acquisition in one budget controlled by the Department of Administration where space needs can be prioritized.

Rationale: Under the present system, funding for renovation, moving and space acquisition is included in individual agency budgets. Also department heads can shift funds from other accounts to cover these kinds of expenses. There is little incentive not to use these funds.

3. The Department of Administration should prepare an annual report describing (a) the amount of space occupied by state agencies including its location, whether it is leased or state owned, the rental rates, lease type, expiration date of the lease (b) the number of leases processed and the percentage processed for space not previously rented by the state (c) state agency moves including location before and after, cost, changes in square footage, number of employees involved, number of days involved, time elapsed between the contact by the agency and the move, reason for moving, source of funding (d) remodeling projects undertaken including cost and agency.

Rationale: The Department does not have this information compiled at the present time yet it seems essential to develop such a data base for long range planning purposes.

4. The Legislature should receive notification from state agencies or departments prior to all moves. The agency would be allowed to move unless the Legislature objected.

Rationale: The Legislature is not notified of agency moves during the biennium unless the agency needs funding in order to move.

While some moves are specifically authorized by the Legislature others are financed out of agency budgets. Presently, agencies must notify the Legislature prior to accepting federal funds because of the long range fiscal impact.

5. The Legislature should consider creating a Buildings Committee composed of members of both the House and the Senate to be responsible for space allocation and acquisition issues.

Rationale: The Legislature had a Buildings Commission between 1957 to 1973 which prepared the Capitol Budget request. Since 1973, the Governor has prepared the Capitol Budget Request and the Appropriations and Finance Committees have written the Buildings Bill after researching the requests. These committees have also dealt with space issues in each agency budget. It is important to establish a committee in the Legislature where space issues can be addressed in a coordinated fashion, and expertise can be developed.

6. The House Appropriations Committee should hold hearings on the Minnesota State Facility Master Planning Process Report and related space allocation during the 1981 Session.

Rationale: The meeting held by the House Committee on Waste and Mismanagement served as a preliminary review. The contract requires the consultant to make a presentation on the report and the issue deserves further attention.

7. The House Appropriations Committee should review the results of a Legislative Audit Commission study now in progress on the current leasing procedures of the Department of Administration.

Rationale: The study is expected to provide data on whether Department procedures result in favorable leasing conditions, and the best possible space. The cost implications are important.

IV. STATE PRINTING AND DUPLICATING OPERATION

Various statutes centralize the responsibility for printing, duplicating and mailing services in the Department of Administration. The process of "putting ink on paper" involves writing specifications for the job, estimating the costs, producing or "buying" the work, reviewing the finished product and getting it to the customer in a timely fashion. The Publications and General Services Division handles over 20,000 orders from state agencies each year referring some to outside vendors and handling the others in-house. During FY 1980, state agencies spent approximately $1,568,949 on photo copies and copy machine expenses, $2,137,085 on in-house duplicating and printing and $6,655,181 on services from non-state shops.

In the past few years, there have been many complaints about the printing and duplicating operation. Two major studies have outlined management and cost accounting problems in the Division. First, the Governor's Task Force on Waste and Mismanagement directed by Robert E. Goff finalized a report in December 1978 which found that: agency printing liaison officers were often haphazardly placed in agencies and needed better training; there were no production time schedules for jobs procured; there was no quality control and complaint system for vendor work; there was excessive use of copy machines. The major problem identified was the lack of accurate financial reporting and cost accounting. Specifically, price schedules did not reflect the actual costs of completing the job and were often higher than private shops, billing invoices were sometimes altered and there were no production data for equipment. Two certified public accountants loaned to the study by the Minnesota Society of Certified Public Accountants recommended ways for the Division to achieve cost center rates.

In 1979, the Department of Administration commissioned the Council of State Governments to study these serious management problems further. The study team, state printers from both California and Washington, completed their report in August 1979. The report identified such problems as: an organizational structure which lacked clear-cut definitions of responsibility and authority particularly in specification writing; lack of a quality control mechanism for procured jobs; absence of opportunities for career development, competitive pay scales and cross-skill training on equipment; unrealistic expectations of the agency printing liaison officers; equipment that was not suited to the heavy demand for two-sided duplicating; arbitrary procedures for "make vs buy" decisions. Again, as in the 1978 report, major problems were identified in the financial reporting and cost accounting area. The study team pointed to a lack of production data on equipment, lack of an accounting officer, lack of hourly rates for operations performed, and the absence of cost center rates. In general, both studies suggested that the printing and duplicating services provided to state agencies were not cost effective or timely and that numerous management problems in the Division impeded better performance. It was the task of the Committee to learn if improvements had been made since the fall of 1979.

Actions taken:

1. A State Printing User Satisfaction Survey was developed and sent to 23 department and agency heads.

   Survey responses were received from 21 departments and agencies. Two departments submitted responses from several divisions resulting in a total of 33 responses. The summary and response forms were forwarded to the Department of Administration and the Printing Advisory Committee.

Question 1. Have printing orders by your agency been delivered on time? If not, please list specific examples and give the time of delay for each.

positive	25
negative	8

Question 2. Is the turn-around time on state printing operations satisfactory? If not, please list current turn-around time and your agency's desired turn-around time.

positive	27
negative	6

Question 3. Has the quality of state printing jobs been acceptable?

positive	30
negative	3

Question 4. Does your agency feel that the current pricing mechanism is fair and equitable?

positive	21
negative	10
no answer	2

Question 5. Has the training of your agency's printing liaison officer (PLO) been helpful in assuring that your agency's orders are an accurate reflection of the specific operation which you would like the state printer to accomplish?

positive	21
negative	8
no answer	4

Generally the answers were positive, however, common negative comments included: slow delivery time from vendors, much monitoring is required to get timely delivery, quality control needs to be improved, the pricing mechanism isn't understood, training and information isn't readily available to PLO's.

2. Staff and the chairman met with the appropriate Assistant Commissioner and the Acting Business Manager of the Publications and General Services Division to discuss the reorganization in progress. The Department of Administration was also requested to prepare a written report outlining

services provided, equipment inventory, users, advisory councils, implementation status of recommendations in the two reports and a time-table for meeting future goals.

The Division appears to be making progress toward providing better, more cost effective services to state agencies. A recent staff reorganization has resulted in clearer lines of authority. A new planning and estimating section as well as a new business office have been created. Printing services are being centralized at 117 University Avenue while copy centers located in three locations provide service for short orders requiring only press time and collating. Two new double-sided automated presses, which have been purchased and will be installed in the copy centers, should result in quicker service. The Division utilized a printing management consultant recommended by Printing Industries of America to develop some new accounting procedures. The most recent price schedule was derived from actual costs for the first time.

The Division report states that the recommendations from the Governor's Task Force on Waste and Mismanagement in 1978 have been implemented. During fiscal year 1980 emphasis was placed on implementing the recommendations in the 1979 Council of State Governments Report, particularly those related to staff reorganization and development of an accounting system. The report describes the actions taken to date and notes that the Division intends to complete the implementation process by June 30, 1981. In general, the report indicates that progress has been made in improving the operation of the Division.

3. The Committee requested the assistance of some outside experts to evaluate the accounting procedures of the Publication and General Services Division.

The two certified public accountants who were loaned to the Governor's Task Force on Waste and Mismanagement in 1978 were contacted but were unavailable. The Legislative Auditor was requested to assign staff to do an audit by early December. While this request was denied, the Legislative Auditor has indicated that a review of the general services fund, including the printing division activity, will be conducted in January.

4. Staff looked at some general measures which could be taken to reduce the cost of publications.

Recommendations:

1. The Program Evaluation Division of the Legislative Auditor should conduct a study of the Publications and General Services Division after June 30, 1981.

Rationale: The Division expects to complete the implementation of recommendations made in the 1979 Council of State Governments Report by the end of fiscal year 1981. It is important to determine if this has been accomplished and if timely, low-cost, quality services are being provided to state agencies.

2. The Legislative Auditor should forward the results of the audit of the printing division activity of the general services fund to the House Appropriations Committee and Senate Finance Committee.

Rationale: If accounting problems persist, some legislative action may be necessary.

3. The Legislature should enact a law requiring that the following information be displayed on each state publication printed: annual cost to print, cost to print per copy, mandate for the publication, where the report can be purchased and that copies

can be borrowed through local libraries through MINITEX.

Rationale: It is important that readers of state publications become aware of the costs to print them.

4. The Legislature should enact a law requiring that all state publications be labeled with the date, title, responsible agency, author, and consecutive pages.

Rationale: This type of labeling will save time of readers.

5. State agencies should be required to describe publications as an activity in their budget request.

Rationale: Legislators should be informed of the publications activity as it can be costly.