

PERFORMANCE REPORT
ON THE
OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
FOR THE PERIOD
JULY 1, 1981 - JUNE 30, 1982

September 1, 1982

The functions of the Office of the Revisor of Statutes are established by law, rule, or custom. Those functions are:

- drafting bills, resolutions, and amendments for the members of the Legislature, the heads of departments, and the Governor;
 - examine bills and endorse approval of both form and compliance with Joint Rules and House Rules;
 - drafting administrative rules upon the request of an agency;
 - examining all administrative rules and approving or rejecting their form;
 - compiling and publishing the Laws of Minnesota, Minnesota Statutes, and Minnesota Statutes Supplement together with indexes and a wide variety of tables;
 - publish rules adopted by the Minnesota Supreme Court and other courts;
 - compiling and publishing Minnesota Rules and Minnesota Rules Supplement together with an index and finding aids;
 - accumulating data on the operation and effect of laws in other states;
 - indexing bills and resolutions drafted for the Legislature;
 - prepare and have available for use indexes of the permanent and general laws and all permanent local laws of this state;
 - maintaining files of all documents prepared by the Revisor's staff;
 - preparing studies of laws and special bills to revise laws as directed by a committee appointed by the Legislature or the Governor;
 - preparing and publishing a bill drafting manual;
 - preparing and publishing a rule drafting manual;
 - engrossing and enrolling bills for the Senate and House;
-
- preparing a biennial report on Supreme Court opinions which criticized or found statutes to be unconstitutional;
 - keeping records on legislation passed by the Legislature;
 - serve as one of four state commissioners on the Uniform Laws Commission;

- preparing and submitting bills to the Legislature which clarify existing statutes;
- preparing bill comparison reports for the Secretary of the Senate and Chief Clerk of the House;
- preparing special comparisons of appropriations bills for use by appropriations conference committees to arrive at a compromise on major appropriations bills;
- developing and maintaining a computer system for use by the Revisor's Office for the production of legislative documents;
- upon request assisting Senate staff to prepare new systems for their use;
- 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;
- drafting conference committee reports;
- upon request providing advice upon the legal, economic, or social effect of any bill or proposed bill;
- publishing Actions, the yearly summary of legislative bills enacted into law;
- upon request of a standing committee of the House, preparing a Revisor's analysis of a bill; and,
- providing legal assistance to the Legislative Committee to Review Administrative Rules.

Despite this extensive list, the principal functions of the office are drafting and publishing. The performance of these major duties in the terms of production volume is shown in the tables on the following pages. However, the office should not be judged by these statistics alone. In order to ensure continued high quality performance, the office has established a yearly program of setting objectives and subsequent self-evaluation.

This written review is the office's fourth self-evaluation of its yearly performance. It is intended to provide a more comprehensive and detailed look at how the office has performed than merely looking at production statistics or making a "seat of the pants" judgment on how "well" the office is doing. In the first section, the review shows that the office set six difficult goals for the year and did a remarkably good job at meeting them. In the second section, the office's performance on each of its assigned functions is analyzed. In the third section, many other specific accomplishments are listed.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

BILL DRAFTING OPERATIONS

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>Drafting Files</u>	<u>Net Drafting Files Introduced</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Amendment Drafts</u>	<u>Gross Bill Introductions</u>	<u>Bill Comparisons</u>	<u>Conference Committee Reports</u>
1969	4050	*	*	*	5776	*	*
1971	4908	*	*	*	6012	*	*
Special	566	*	*	*	497	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>5474</u>	*	*	*	<u>6509</u>	*	*
1973	4771	*	*	*	5113	*	*
1974	2030	*	*	*	2202	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>6801</u>	<u>3621</u>	<u>53%</u>	*	<u>7315</u>	*	*
1975	3683	*	*	*	3643	*	*
1976	1541	*	*	*	1654	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>5224</u>	<u>2645</u>	<u>51%</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>5297</u>	*	*
1977	3301	*	*	388	3268	197	*
1978	1418	*	*	*	1680	171	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>4719</u>	<u>3049</u>	<u>65%</u>	*	<u>4948</u>	<u>368</u>	*
1979	3267	1998	61%	425	3249	138	49
Special	8	3		0	3	0	0
1980	1571	974	62%	454	1692	180	55
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>4846</u>	<u>2975</u>	<u>61%</u>	<u>879</u>	<u>4944</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>104</u>
1981	2901	1817	63%	395	3018	227	72
Specials	35	18	51%	10	27	0	0
1982	1562	876	56%	404	1484	159	62
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>4498</u>	<u>2711</u>	<u>60%</u>	<u>809</u>	<u>4529</u>	<u>386</u>	<u>134</u>

*=Statistics not available

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

STATUTORY EDITORIAL OPERATIONS

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>Chapters</u>	<u>Session Law Pages</u>	<u>Average Per Chapter</u>	<u>Statute or Supplement Pages</u>	<u>Statutory Sections-Amended</u>	<u>Statutory Sections-New</u>	<u>Statutory Sections-Repealed</u>	<u>Statutory Sections-Other</u>	<u>Total Statutory Sections Affected</u>
1969	1159	2678	2.31	6453	1629	1253	427	1	3310
1971	966	2156	2.23	None	1543	1121	478	6	3148
Special	48	387	8.06	None	127	107	86	0	320
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>1014</u>	<u>2543</u>	<u>2.50</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>1670</u>	<u>1228</u>	<u>564</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3468</u>
1973	783	2472	3.15	1280	1965	1173	1210	0	4348
1974	583	1457	2.50	7091	1120	950	599	0	2669
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>1366</u>	<u>3929</u>	<u>2.87</u>	<u>8371</u>	<u>3085</u>	<u>2123</u>	<u>1809</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>7017</u>
1975	437	1623	3.72	958	1335	851	714	0	2900
1976	348	1405	4.04	7509	1533	748	782	0	3063
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>785</u>	<u>3028</u>	<u>3.86</u>	<u>8467</u>	<u>2868</u>	<u>1599</u>	<u>1496</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5963</u>
1977	455	1449	3.19	874	1508	652	543	0	2703
1978	342	1251	3.66	8253	1315	535	312	0	2162
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>797</u>	<u>2700</u>	<u>3.39</u>	<u>9127</u>	<u>2823</u>	<u>1187</u>	<u>855</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4865</u>
1979	340	1297	3.78	757	1233	508	389	0	2130
Special	3	1621	5.73	10,704	1606	838	598	0	3042
1980	283	2918	4.66	11,461	2839	1346	987	0	5172
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>626</u>	<u>2918</u>	<u>4.66</u>	<u>11,461</u>	<u>2839</u>	<u>1346</u>	<u>987</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5172</u>
1981 & Specials	381	2602	7.19	1732	2522	975	875	25	4397
1982 & Specials	272	1786	6.57	11,509	1543	667	443	21	2675
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>653</u>	<u>4388</u>	<u>6.73</u>	<u>13,241</u>	<u>4065</u>	<u>1642</u>	<u>1318</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>7072</u>

*-Statistics Not Available

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	Vetoes	Senate & House Resolutions Enrolled
1969	*	*	*	*	*	680	490	1170	3	8
1971	*	*	*	*	*	435	539	974	3	5
Special	*	*	*	*	*	16	35	51	2	1
TOTAL	*	*	*	*	*	451	574	1025	5	6
1973	*	*	*	*	*	420	363	783	0	8
1974	*	*	*	*	*	297	286	583	0	2
TOTAL	*	*	*	*	*	717	649	1366	0	10
1975	763	648	2	4	1411	257	180	437	1	1
1976	475	432	73	6	907	174	176	350	4	2
TOTAL	1238	1080	75	10	2318	431	356	787	5	3
1977	608	716	67	6	1324	211	244	455	0	1
1978	544	431	58	15	975	242	100	342	0	2
TOTAL	1152	1147	125	21	2299	453	344	797	0	3
1979	1494	584	65	7	1078	194	151	345	5	3
Special)))))	1	2	3	0	0
1980	381	511	53	4	892	139	144	283	5	0
TOTAL	875	1095	118	11	1970	334	297	631	10	3
1981	1388	633	26	14	1021	194	192	386	7	3
Specials) 20	7	0	0	27	13	7	20	1	1
1982	461	435	24	12	696	161	125	286	10	5
TOTAL	869	1075	50	26	1944	368	324	692	18	9

*=Statistics not available

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
 YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - SOURCE AND TYPE OF RULE DRAFTING REQUESTS

	<u>Agencies Served</u>	<u>Department-level Agencies</u>	<u>Smaller Agencies</u>	<u>Original Drafts by Revisor</u>	<u>Agency Drafts Needing Few Changes</u>	<u>Agency Drafts Needing Many Changes</u>
F.Y. 1982	46	13	33	80	15	65

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - DRAFTING AND FORM APPROVAL OF PROPOSED RULES

	<u>Drafting Files</u>	<u>Rough Drafts Prepared</u>	<u>Preliminary Drafts Prepared</u>	<u>Final Proposed Rule Drafts Approved</u>	<u>Total (2)+(3)+(4)</u>	<u>Average Drafts Per File</u>
F.Y. 1982	200	175	104	201	480	3

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - DRAFTING AND FORM APPROVAL OF ADOPTED RULES

	<u>Modification Drafts after Proposed Stage</u>	<u>Files Disapproved at Adoption Stage</u>	<u>Files Approved after Disapproval</u>	<u>Files Approved Without being Disapproved</u>	<u>Total Files Approved For Adoption</u>
F.Y. 1982	109	44*	44*	80	124

99

* One-half of these files represent rules proposed without revisor approval before July 1, 1981.

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
 YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ADMINISTRATIVE RULES - STATISTICS RELATED TO RIE PUBLICATION OPERATIONS

	<u>Pages in Supplement I</u>	<u>Pages in Supplement II</u>	<u>Pages in Minnesota Rules Publication</u>	<u>Drafts Included in Supplement I</u>	<u>Drafts Included in Supplement II</u>
F.Y. 1982	*	*	*	*	*

OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ENROLLED BILLS - PRIMARY DRAFTING SOURCE #

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>Revisor</u>	<u>Legislator or No.I.D.</u>	<u>Executive Department</u>	<u>House Research</u>	<u>Senate Counsel</u>	<u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>Total</u>
1969	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1971	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Special	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1973	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1974	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1975	77	123	69	3	18	36	111	437
1976	80	103	39	2	14	18	92	348
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>157</u> (20%)	<u>226</u> (29%)	<u>108</u> (14%)	<u>5</u> (1%)	<u>32</u> (4%)	<u>54</u> (7%)	<u>203</u> (26%)	<u>785</u>
1977	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1978	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>283</u> (36%)	<u>250</u> (31%)	<u>132</u> (17%)	<u>30</u> (4%)	<u>38</u> (5%)	<u>33</u> (4%)	<u>28</u> (4%)	<u>794</u>
1979	127	106	23	15	31	33	0	335
Special								
1980	115	82	48	13	21	4	0	283
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>242</u> (39%)	<u>188</u> (30%)	<u>71</u> (11%)	<u>28</u> (5%)	<u>52</u> (8%)	<u>37</u> (6%)	<u>0</u> (0%)	<u>618</u>
1981	182 (48%)	44 (12%)	74 (19%)	20 (5%)	29 (8%)	32 (8%)	0 (0%)	381
Regular & Specials								
1982	156 (57%)	46 (17%)	17 (6%)	31 (11%)	24 (9%)	1 (0%)	0 (0%)	275
Regular & Specials								
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>338</u> (52%)	<u>90</u> (14%)	<u>91</u> (14%)	<u>51</u> (8%)	<u>53</u> (8%)	<u>33</u> (5%)	<u>0</u> (0%)	<u>656</u>

#=Not necessarily the original drafting source

* Statistics not available

Section 1

Specific Factors: Goal Completion

Two years ago, the Revisor's Office set up eleven specific office goals. Five were to be completed within the first year and six within two years. The office goals were to be used as a measure of office performance from year to year. This portion of the report presents an analysis of whether the established two year goals have been met.

Goal:

Rules Publication. To the extent appropriations permit, make appropriate progress on implementing recompilation and drafting of Administrative Rules as stated in the publication plan.

Performance:

Substantial progress has been achieved on the goal of recompiling MCAR into a new publication to be called Minnesota Rules.

A plan of work has been implemented based on lines to be recompiled. The plan sets monthly achievement quotas and provides for completion of the recompiler's work by December 1, 1982. As of July 22, 1982, approximately 40,000 lines of material had been recompiled, proofed, and made ready for composition. A total of 390,000 lines have to be recompiled. Entry of the recompiler's work will occur simultaneously with and also after the completion of the recompilation.

Rules adopted since the recompilation project began are being separated for recompiling and sent to the recompilers on a monthly basis.

The data base to be used for recompiling the rule drafting is being proofed by teams of proofers. As of July 22, 1982, approximately 130,000 lines out of 390,000 lines in the data base had been proofed. The goal is to finish proofing in September 1982.

Work is in progress on editorial features to be included in Minnesota Rules. A plan has been devised for citing statutory authority for rules. Card files are being maintained for the State Register publication history for rules and for incorporations by references. Card files are being maintained for new rules and for rules amended and repealed.

Contracts have been let for the composition and printing of Minnesota Rules and for the editorial preparation for an index to Minnesota Rules.

In addition work is being done on planning for the periodic publication of Minnesota Rules, supplement to Minnesota Rules, and extracts from Minnesota Rules. The work includes consultation with computer staff about ways of providing the best computer service assistance to the various publications.

The office has also substantially completed the goal of setting up a rule drafting department with staff trained for rule drafting.

As with bill drafts which must be approved as to form by the Revisor's office with drafting assistance given when requested, all rule drafts must be approved as to form with drafting assistance on request. And, as with bills, the office also reviews the substantive and legal clarity of rules under a special mandate by law to encourage the use of plain English and avoid technical language in rules. Consequently, the rule drafting functions of the office include reviews for technical form and substantive clarity along with comprehensive drafting assistance on request of an agency.

Special training to perform these functions has been given to office attorneys and data entry staff in the last year in the form of seminars and distribution of a rule drafting manual. The manual includes form and style guidelines as well as material on drafting techniques for clarity.

The office also conducted special drafting seminars for agency personnel and distributed the manual at these seminars on request. Individual staff members have also met with particular agency staff at the agency's request to help with comprehensive rewriting of some rules. The help has been well-received.

The office continues to stress the importance of making the substance of rules more clear to the public, in keeping with the original office goal. The outline style of MCAR has been discarded, for instance, in favor of writing more readable complete paragraphs and sentences. Office staff have received special training on how to write legal language aimed largely at an audience untrained in law. While the office does not review rules for the wisdom of their substantive policies, the office does encourage agencies to make the policies and requirements of rules clear to the public. Agency people initially leery of our role, have usually been happy with our actual performance.

Along with this basic goal of drafting clear rules, the office also originally intended to make the format of rule amendments the same as that used in bills (title, enacting clause, introductory lines for each section amended, etc.). The office judges at this time that further changes in rule drafting merely for uniformity with bill drafting is not advisable. Too many parties are already familiar with the old way, and it has no serious flaws warranting the confusion that would result from a radical format change. The paramount goal of the original plan for drafting, rule clarity, is being achieved without changing the format.

Please refer to page 20, for further details on the form approval process. Refer to page 19, for details about rule drafting assistance by the office.

Goal:

Statutory Index. To the extent appropriations permit, make appropriate progress on the reindexing of 1982 Minnesota Statutes by a contractor. Set up procedures to coordinate and control ongoing indexing, and in conjunction with contractor, draft indexing standards to be used.

Performance:

Budget cuts eliminated the reindexing by a contractor of Minnesota Statutes for the 1982 publication. Instead, the Revisor's staff developed a plan for long and short range improvements of the index and implemented the plan for the 1982 index.

Long term projects, begun in the 1982 index, are as follows:

1. Removing numbered parts used in some main headings.
2. Adding a new main heading, DEFINITIONS, for words and phrases defined in new or reindexed sections.
3. Increasing the number of main subject headings with particular attention to providing specific and meaningful points of access to the index user.

Short term improvements made in the 1982 index are as follows:

1. Reindexing the old main headings AERONAUTICS, CIVIL SERVICE, ELECTRICITY, ELECTRICIANS and ESTATES.
2. Breaking down the main heading EDUCATION into several sections with former subheadings converted into new main headings.
3. Changing the typeface of italicized cross-references to make them consistent with the same type of cross-references within a section.
4. Correcting misspelled words.
5. Making punctuation consistent, including removal of semicolons.
6. Replacing "post" and "ante" directives at cross-references within a section with "above" and "below" to make the directives consistent.

The indexing standards were firmly established when a contract with West Publishing was signed for the indexing work on the Minnesota Rules. The standards are the guide for ongoing work on Minnesota Statutes so that the ultimate goal of compatibility in the Rules and Statutes publications can be achieved.

A rough draft of guidelines and examples for the technical aspects of the index such as capitalization, punctuation, and spacing was written. The guide will be used by data entry operators and supervisors in checking to insure uniformity.

Goal:

Local Laws Project. Make appropriate progress on correcting the existing local law table and extending its inclusive dates back to an appropriate ending date around the year 1900.

Performance:

The close liaison with the Hamline University School of Law has continued during the past year. The local law project has been completed in time for inclusion in the 1982 Statutes.

Although a few of the local entities could not be identified in some of the more ancient laws, the updated table will include substantially all local law enactments from 1892 to 1982. The corrections made in the existing table and the inclusion of local laws as far back as 1892 will greatly enhance the usefulness of the table.

After completion of the indexing back to 1892, the project will then extend the index back to the creation of Minnesota as a territory. This will not be done by analysis of the laws passed each year, as was done for the first part of the project, but by using Kelly's Index. Kelly's Index contains the same information but was discontinued in 1892. When completed, the whole index will be printed for internal use. It will later be updated (for 1983 and 1984 laws) and printed in Minnesota Statutes 1984.

Goal:

Computer Services. To the extent appropriations permit, make appropriate progress on implementing recommendations of Consultant's Computer Study.

Performance:

Work continued on development and changes recommended by the consultant. In addition, major steps were taken to augment computer services. See pages 38 to 40.

Goal:

Publication of Statutes. The Minnesota Statutes 1982 will be published with cross-references after each section and with all section headnotes examined and corrected as needed and with all subdivisions having headnotes.

Performance:

As indicated last year, it was decided not to attempt to accomplish this goal for now. The addition of cross-references would necessitate unacceptable delay in the publication of Statutes. Work on the headnotes was determined to be very time-consuming for both professional and technical staff. Because of the work required on recompiling rules, sufficient staff resources are not available to accomplish this goal. As a result, work on both goals was deferred. It may be reconsidered for possible inclusion in Minnesota Statutes 1984.

Goal:

Style and Form Redrafts of Chapters. Include style and form redrafts in 1981 and 1982 Revisor's bills submitted to the Legislature.

Performance:

Style and form redrafts of two separate chapters of Minnesota Statutes were submitted to the legislature in the 1981 session. One was passed and the other was withdrawn because it conflicted with a substantive bill revising the same chapter.

Plans were made to prepare additional style and form redrafts for the 1982 session, but due to pressure of other work only one was prepared. This draft changed all references in the entire statutes to federal laws and regulations to a specific consistent form. It required an extensive amount of research into federal laws to prepare. The bill was approved by the Judiciary Committees in each house and introduced. It was not passed because it was desired to see if there were any adverse comments first. Only one was received, and it is expected that those objections can be overcome. The bill will be revised and reintroduced next year.

It is intended to make the style and form redrafts of chapters a continuing function of the office.

Section 2

Performance of Assigned Functions

The laws of Minnesota as well as legislative rules and customs assign specific functions to the Revisor's office to perform. On the following pages each of those functions is stated, its source is noted, and the office's response during the year to perform the function is analyzed.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (1).

Performance:

The office received 1573 requests for bills and resolutions for the 1982 regular legislative session and the special sessions. In addition, 404 amendments and 67 conference committee reports were drafted.

The Legislature enacted 272 chapters into law in the 1982 regular session, three chapters in the 1981 third special session, three in the 1982 first special session, and two in the 1982 second special session. An analysis of the primary drafting source of enrolled bills show that 49 percent originated in the Revisor's office. (The sources are shown on the table at the beginning of this report.) The percentage is stable when compared with prior years. The lack of any perceptible switch of legislators to other competing sources of drafting assistance shows continued satisfaction with the quality of the office's drafting work.

The 1982 regular and special sessions were of short duration. Because of the short sessions many drafting requests were "rush requests," and the office had less time to complete them. In spite of the time problem, the drafts were of good quality, very few were returned for corrections, and substantially all of the drafts were completed within the time limits required.

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:

All bills prepared for introduction in the house are reviewed by the drafting attorney as to form and compliance with the joint rules of the legislature and the rules of the house. After review the attorney endorses his or her approval on the bill by initialing the covers in the space provided. In the past year, only one bill was returned to the office for lack of approval.

Function:

- drafting administrative rules upon the request of an agency.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.50, subdivision 1, clause (e).

Performance:

As with most other rule-related functions, drafting assistance has been given by the Revisor's office only for the last year. (See page 9, for details on the establishment and training of a rule drafting department.)

In addition to the 44 set of rules submitted for form approval only at the adoption stage as noted on the following page, 46 agencies submitted almost 200 sets of rules for form approval or drafting assistance before proposal in the State Register. Attorneys and other office staff prepared more than 800 drafts for those 200 files. The agencies' initial contacts with the Revisor's office were usually before the agency had solidified its own position on the substance of the rules, necessitating several preliminary drafts for many rules.

The office originally anticipated receiving rule drafts in fairly final form from the larger departments with specially trained drafters. Rule drafting assistance to smaller agencies and boards was more expected. The last year's experience, however, has been contrary to this expectation. Only 27 percent of the rule sets submitted were typed drafts that needed few changes; 33 percent were typed drafts that needed many changes; and 40 percent of the rule files opened by the office were for rules to be originally drafted by the Revisor's attorneys with no typed drafts submitted. Moreover, of the 40 percent (80 files) that were originally drafted in the Revisor's office, the majority, 55 files, were from 13 department level agencies. Only 25 files were from the smaller agencies and boards. The Revisor's attorneys welcome the opportunity to do original drafting but it has taken more staff time and computer time than originally anticipated in the office's two-year plan for the rule drafting department.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 15.0412, subdivision 2a; and 648.50, subdivision 6.

Performance:

This was the first year the office was required to perform this function. Form approval occurred twice for each set of rules finally adopted by an agency, once at the stage just before it was proposed to the public in the State Register and again when the rule was adopted in order to check changes the agency may have made since the original proposal.

No rules were rejected for form irregularities at the proposal stage. Even when agencies did not follow the guidelines in the rule manuals distributed by the Revisor's office, their rules were not rejected. The office attorneys simply worked with the agency to correct the form without altering the agency's intended meaning. There were few requests for mere form approval, perhaps in recognition that review for clarity and substantive effect by another set of highly trained attorneys could only help the agency as long as that type of review was not binding except as to form. (See function, next page, for further details on rule drafting assistance for agencies.)

Forty-four sets of rules out of 124 eventually approved at the adoption stage were originally disapproved as to form. Half of these disapprovals involved sets of rules that were not reviewed by the office until that stage because they were proposed in the Register before July 1, 1981. The other half involved unacceptable form changes caused by modifications after the proposal stage or correction of errors like cross-references or misspellings. Most disapproved rules were approved less than a day later after the agency and the attorney general's staff agreed to the requested form changes. No rule was prevented from adoption by form disapproval.

The office has recently started a new procedure approved by the attorney general's staff which will allow rules to be approved as to form subject to certain editorial changes so that erroneous cross-references and misspellings no longer lead to form disapproval. This has significantly reduced paper shuffling and demands to turn "disapproved rules" into "approved rules" within unreasonably short time periods.

Function:

- compiling and publishing the Laws of Minnesota, Minnesota Statutes, and Minnesota Statutes Supplement together with indexes and a wide variety of tables.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.07, subdivision 1; and 648.31, subdivisions 1 to 4.

Performance:

Laws 1981 and Minnesota Statutes 1981 Supplement were compiled and published in 1981. Both productions were massive, the largest of their kind in Minnesota history.

Laws 1981 was available for general distribution September 28, 1981, despite the additional material and the interruptions in publishing occasioned by special sessions in June and July. Laws 1981 was published 88 days after the adjournment of the second special session.

Minnesota Statutes 1981 Supplement was available for general distribution November 12, 1981. Discounting changes in format and type size, it was about twice the length of the 1979 publication.

Both publications involve much editorial work and incorporate extensive reference material including large indexes and information tables.

All this work was accomplished by employees who were on call at all times and often employed in other office work. Publication work benefits both from the expertise of the persons assigned to the work and by the constant improvement of office word processing programs and procedures.

After the 1981 publications, work on Laws 1982 and Minnesota Statutes 1982 proceeded steadily and is on schedule despite the effects of three more special sessions.

The publishing functions were carried out well in the last year. The publications were very accurate, economical in both labor and cash costs, and fast.

For information on indexing, see page 11.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 480.057, subdivision 2.

Performance:

Work on the 1982 edition of the court rule volume is in progress as of the date of this report. Tapes will be delivered to the vendor in August.

The court rule project staff has diligently and cooperatively processed complex material requiring new production and editorial skills.

The court rule project staff has accomplished or is in the process of accomplishing the following work relating to preparing the court rules for publication:

1) the staff found and corrected numerous errors in the vendors tape used in publishing the 1980 edition of the court rules;

2) the staff identified codes from the vendor's tape and determined codes to be used for keyboarding court rules;

3) staff has learned to use special type specification coding for tables and new material;

4) a new computer program was written to provide a uniform block indentation style for the court rule volume; and

5) editorial procedures, including use of a looseleaf binder system for preparation of amendments for keyboarding and keeping track of correspondence, were established to assure proper sequencing of work and quality control.

Improvements in the 1982 edition of the court rule volume include:

1) the court rules were entered in our computerized data base in order to improve the efficiency of the rule updating function and enhance the quality control aspect of preparing accurate copy of the rules for publication;

2) readability of court rules was enhanced by adoption of a uniform block indentation style for court rules;

3) the staff prepared a preface written in a practical "how-to-do-it" style designed to provide users with an overview of court organization and to guide users easily and quickly through the complex and rapidly expanding body of court rules.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.50, subdivision 1, clauses (a) to (c) and (g).

Performance:

Despite budgetary obstacles, progress has been made in compiling and publishing Minnesota Rules. A plan has been implemented for the actual manual recompilation of MCAR. The goal is to complete the manual recompilation by December 1, 1982. Entry of the recompiled material into the data base is occurring simultaneously with the actual recompilation. As of July 22, 1982, approximately ten percent of the recompilation had been completed and made ready for composition.

Entry of more recompiled material has been postponed until the data base to be used for rules drafting and publishing can be properly proofed and edited. The task of preparing a reliable data base should be completed by September 1982.

Contracts have been let for the composition and printing of Minnesota Rules and for the preparation of an index to Minnesota Rules.

Progress has been made on the various editorial features to be included in Minnesota Rules. A concordance table is being prepared for each chapter of Minnesota Rules as part of the recompilation process. The table will show the old MCAR citation and the new Minnesota Rules citation. Card files are being maintained to prepare the table showing incorporations by reference. A card file is being maintained showing the "State Register" publication date for rules adopted since July 1, 1981. A plan has been prepared to provide the statutory authority for each rule.

A revised style and form manual has been prepared for the recompilation project. The manual will be helpful in drafting new rules.

A plan is being prepared for the operation of the Revisor's office with respect to future publications connected with rules. The plan will be comprehensive and include computer assistance, staffing needs, and methods of operation.

In conclusion, substantial progress has been made on the goal of recompiling and publishing Minnesota Rules.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (2).

Performance:

This mandate was apparently intended to result in the Revisor maintaining a library. For many years the Revisor did maintain extensive files on the operation and effect of laws and actively acquired more information for the files. It was concluded, however, that this mandate duplicated the mandate of the Legislative Research Library. So, the files were turned over to that library and active work on expanding the files ceased.

Now, this mandate is fulfilled only by the Revisor's active encouragement of his staff to request acquisition of specialized legal treatises in their assigned bill drafting subject areas. Several have acquired modest libraries which they actively use in drafting work.

Function:

- indexing bills and resolutions drafted for the Legislature.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (3).

Performance:

The office maintains an index of all requests received for bills and resolutions. Each request is assigned a bill drafting number, a general subject matter title, and a brief sub-title identifying the particular thrust of the legislation.

The index consists of two parts. One part lists the requests under general subject matter titles. The other part lists all requests made by each legislator or agency under the name of the legislator or agency.

The index was updated in the past year. The general subject matter titles were reduced in number and changed to reflect present nomenclature. The sub-titles have been improved to make identification easier.

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 1980, section 482.09, clause (4).

Performance:

See statutory index goal on page 11.

Function:

- maintaining files of all documents prepared by the Revisor's staff.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (5).

Performance:

This mandate appears to require only the maintaining of normal records necessary to the drafting process. This has been done.

During the year the current engrossing and enrolling files were moved from file drawers to open lateral files. As a result, these important records are kept in a more accessible way and floor space was freed for other purposes.

It is now contemplated that bill drafting records more than four year old will be destroyed rather than depositing them in archives. There is no point in keeping the old files. They are not public records and do not contain useful information even if they were. For drafters, it is easier to start over on drafting a bill more than four years old rather than attempting to update the old draft.

Function:

- preparing studies of laws and special bills to revise laws as directed by a committee appointed by the Legislature or the Governor.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (6).

Performance:

No special committees were appointed by the Legislature or the Governor involving bill drafting in which the Revisor was asked to furnish assistance. The Revisor did continue to participate in a committee appointed by the Secretary of State to revise the state's election laws. The drafting required by this committee involved a significant amount of time by a drafter specializing in election laws.

Function:

- preparing and publishing a bill drafting manual.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.09, clause (7).

Performance:

The Minnesota Revisor's Manual was published, and the goal substantially reached, in 1981. In 1982, a supplement to the manual appeared, containing forms for particular types of amendments, for bringing rules under the Administrative Procedure Act, for instructions to the Revisor, and for references to other publications. It also contained a guide to clear style in legal drafting. The guide is intended to apply to rules as well as bills and will appear in the rule drafting manual.

In addition to the manual itself, a sequence of twelve seminars were conducted over the summer. These seminars reviewed important elements in the supplement to the Revisor's Manual. It was intended that all staff be fully informed about the new standards contained in the manual.

Function:

- preparing and publishing a rule drafting manual.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.50, subdivision 1, clause (f).

Performance:

A temporary rule drafting manual was prepared in 1981. When the Revisor's office began the rules project, we had planned to publish the recompiled rules in 1982, and so we believed we would need a permanent manual by July 1982. The budget cut that delayed publication of the recompiled rules also delayed preparation of the manual because it forced a delay in adopting the new format for rules.

So far, work for the manual is complete for the sections that explain the format and editorial style of the rules. The guide to clear writing and "plain language," written for the bill drafting manual, is also ready to be incorporated into the rule drafting manual. Work is still in progress to set policies on some technical matters such as renumbering and repealers and to write explanations of those policies. New sections are being written about statutory provisions governing the content of rules, such as incorporations by reference, and about the form of adopted rules and the approval process.

The committee on rule drafting form change has proposed January 1, 1983, as the changeover date for drafting rules in the new, permanent format. The rule drafting manual should be completed and distributed to agencies slightly before that date.

Function:

- engrossing and enrolling bills for the Senate and House.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.09, clause (8); Joint Rule 2.07.

Performance:

The work of the engrossing and enrolling department went more smoothly than ever this year primarily because of additional assistance from and cooperation with bill drafting and editing supervisors. Meeting high pressure deadlines was easier with a larger pool of supervisors to draw on for help.

Education and training were emphasized this session by the E & E department. New pool personnel were given an overview regarding specific procedures. All of the bill drafting and editing supervisors were taught every phase of E & E procedure including the record keeping involved in handling every kind of document, the "nuts and bolts" of checking engrossments, enrollments, and committee reports, and how and where to deliver completed documents. Also, a great deal of time was spent with the chief committee clerk of the House of Representatives in an attempt to achieve consistency in the handling of House committee reports. The committee reports have continued to be somewhat of a problem, however. Perhaps E & E staff could make a greater effort prior to next session to inform House personnel of any change in drafting policies.

One change was made in the checklist used in the enrolling process and that was the addition of a check signifying whether the document was an act or a resolution. This prevented any resolutions from being enrolled on "ACT" paper and subsequently being assigned chapter numbers.

Minor errors were found in two enrollments sent to the Governor. In both cases lines which had not been amended in the last engrossment were dropped. No wholly satisfactory way of checking for this kind of error has been devised other than "line reading" every document which time constraints do not permit.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.09, clause (10).

Performance:

Since this report is only published in November of even numbered years, it was not published during the period covered by this report.

However, during this period, action was taken to insure the long term preservation of the reports. Copies of all past reports were accumulated and case bound. Some of the bound copies were retained for sale while several others were deposited for permanent preservation in local libraries. Other copies were accumulated into complete sets. These sets can be used as masters for duplication should anyone wish to purchase back editions. Arrangements were made with Public Documents to insure that both bound and individual sets are available for sale to the public.

Function:

- keeping records on legislation passed by the Legislature.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.37, subdivision 1.

Performance:

This somewhat ambiguous mandate has existed since the Revisor's office was established in 1939. As a technical matter the Secretary of the Senate and Chief Clerk of the House maintain all official records of the Legislature. Many of the documents are deposited with the Legislative Reference Library which service partially as the Legislature's archivist.

The Revisor does keep engrossing and enrolling records. However, after each session the oldest records are returned to the custody of the Secretary and Chief Clerk.

The Revisor does maintain, as office records, any errors found in an enrollment. These records serve as one of the basis for the corrections included in each year's Revisor's Bill.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 3.251.

Performance:

During the 1981-1982 fiscal year, Harry Walsh continued to discharge the office duties under section 3.251. He attended and actively participated in the 1981 meeting of the Uniform Laws Conference, serve on committees, and reviewed conference work product throughout the year. Thirteen acts and revisions of acts were prepared for consideration at the 1982 meeting of the conference.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 648.37, subdivision 2; Joint Rule 2.01, sixth unnumbered paragraph.

Performance:

Two separate Revisor's Bills were prepared for the 1982 legislative session. The first was the clarification bill correcting erroneous references and reconciling conflicting provisions resulting from multiple amendments to various sections and subdivisions. The bill contained 133 sections and was passed.

The second bill contained over 300 sections. It contained revisions that standardized the form of references to the United States Code, the Code of Federal Regulations and other foreign publications. It also replaced references to obsolete compilations of law with their current equivalents. It was introduced at the end of the session for the purpose of obtaining comments on the proposed standardization of references. No adverse comments were received and an updated version of the bill will be prepared for the 1983 session.

Revisor's Bills, by their nature, are a continuing function of the office. Substantial progress has been made in improving the statutes by the elimination of erroneous references and the reconciliation of conflicting provisions of law.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by Secretary of the Senate and Chief Clerk of the House).

Performance:

Under rules of the Senate and House, when a companion bill is passed by one house and sent to the other, the companion bills are compared to see if they are identical. Theoretically, the Rules and Administration Committee in the Senate and the Chief Clerk in the House prepare a report either detailing the differences in the bills or that they are identical. In actual fact, all these reports are prepared by the Revisor's staff.

Depending on the complexity of the bill, the preparation of these reports can be easy or very complex. All reports have to be prepared overnight. The work frequently requires work into the early hours of the morning or all night.

In the 1982 session, 159 of these comparison reports were prepared. This was about average for the last six years. The number done is totally dependant on the number of companion bills passed by the Senate or House. A record of the number of reports prepared in past years appears in the table on page 3.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by staff of House appropriations committee and Senate finance committee).

Performance:

These special comparisons are a "side-by-side" printing of comparable provisions of the Senate and House versions of the eight major appropriations bills. These comparisons are the key documents used by the conference committees on those bills. The comparison report is also used to create final conference committee reports. Its use greatly speeded the former method of original preparation. The comparison printing method was devised several years ago by a member of the Revisor's staff and has been used ever since. The preparation of these reports is complex and difficult and often must be done overnight.

Since the eight major appropriations bills are only considered in odd-year sessions, no work was done on them in this fiscal year. However, a special comparison report was prepared for the budget reduction bill in the December 1981 special session of the Legislature. It was prepared overnight and played the usual key role in conference committee deliberations.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: None, but the use of the computer system is the most efficient means of accomplishing work otherwise mandated.

Performance:

In the past year, the following improvements in the computer system were accomplished:

- (1) Court rules were added as a new data base;
- (2) The administrative rules were added as a new data base;
- (3) The online program was modified to allow coding for italic, bold, greek, subscript, and superscript text for administrative and court rules;
- (4) The non-textual material in the administrative rules (tables, illustrations) are being screened to determine susceptibility to computer or manual composition;
- (5) A shift from purchasing computer service from ISB to operating our own system was planned and accomplished. Included in this were:
 - a. a computer system (IBM 4331) and operating system (VM/SP) was selected;
 - b. a computer room including air conditioning, a vault isolation power management system, raised floor, and fire suppression system was built;
 - c. the legislative bill system was converted to run under the VM operating system; and,
 - d. a computer terminal vendor (Lee Data Systems of Eden Prairie) was selected to replace our current aging terminals. It is anticipated that the switch to our own smaller computer will yield a more reliable and responsive service to the users of the system at a lower and predictable cost.
- (6) The Revisor staff in charge of the various publications of the office were assisted in planning and provided with reports and information necessary for their work.

Function:

- upon request, assist Senate staff preparing new computer systems for their use.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the legislature (requested by Senate staff).

Performance:

Since the initial use of the computer by the Revisor's office, the Senate has consistently requested advice and assistance in using the computer to accomplish its work. In many cases, the Senate has found it advantageous to use programs already developed for the use of the Revisor's staff. Sometimes minor modifications are necessary to accommodate the programs to the Senate's application.

During the past year, the Revisor's staff assisted the Senate in the following areas:

(1) A system as set up for the Senate staff to enter Senate and House bill titles and journal reference pages for the journal index.

(2) The Senate was provided with a means to transmit journal copy over telephone lines to their printer rather than physically transferring a tape.

(3) Assisted and advised the Senate staff in the investigation of acquisition of bold-type composition equipment to produce agendas and the journal.

The relationship with the Senate has proved to be mutually beneficial and will continue.

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 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the legislature (requested by senate and house staff).

Performance:

Senate and House staff require access to the Revisor's computer system for the purpose of preparing bills and amendments and for the Senate to produce its calendars and journals. In order to do so, the Revisor must furnish the necessary CRT terminals, printers, and allied equipment. Once furnished, the equipment must be maintained.

In the past year, the Revisor was not requested to furnish additional equipment. However, it was projected that additional requests would be made before the legislative 1983 session began. This projection proved correct for the Senate and House have recently both requested additional equipment. The projection that additional equipment would be needed was one reason for a switch from Megadata equipment to better and more serviceable CRTs. The change from one make to another was carefully planned for.

During the year, other legislative agencies again called the Revisor's office when problems occurred with equipment assigned for their use. One person in the office continues to be designated as the coordinator of efforts to maintain the equipment. This person was readily accepted by outside staff as a troubleshooter who could either fix equipment problems or would call in the people who could fix a problem.

By applying pressure to the vendor, the Revisor was able to obtain the services of a field engineer from Megadata. On two occasions during the year, the engineer spent several days with the Revisor's staff and either repaired nonfunctioning equipment or performed preventative maintenance. Although the problems with the Megadata equipment could not be eliminated, the preventative maintenance at least resulted in permanent resolution of a few problems and the temporary resolution of many others.

It is apparent that the Senate and House will continue to rely on the Revisor to provide and maintain equipment used in connection with programs used by outside staff.

Function:

- drafting conference committee reports.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the Legislature.

Performance:

During the 1982 session the office completed 62 conference committee reports. This was an average number but down ten from the 1981 session. This reflects the unusually high amount of work in the 1981 session (see last year's performance report) rather than a falling off of work. Normally, more conferences occur in the second year of a legislative session. The amount of reports is solely a function of legislative demand and is not controllable by the office.

After last session, the staff evaluated how the office handled conference committee reports. As a result, specific improvements will be made next year. Chief among the changes will be to assign a conference committee report to an attorney immediately upon receiving the bill file from the Senate or House desk. It has been the practice to just file the bill file and not assign an attorney until the office is first contacted by a committee member. Early assignment should permit the office to keep better contact to know the amount of work required and when it will be required. It should also enable us to better schedule our work and to produce better reports. It will also permit assignment to attorneys knowledgeable in a subject to be assigned rather than just assigning whoever happens to be available. It is also planned to revise the logging and filing procedures for conference committee reports.

In summary, while the amount of work was average for the year, the office took concrete actions to improve the effectiveness with which we processed conference committee reports.

Function:

- upon request providing advice upon the legal, economic, or social effect of any bill or proposed bill.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.12, subdivision 4.

Performance:

The legal requirement to provide advice on the legal, economic, or social effect of a bill, upon request, was originally adopted in 1947. Despite the mandate, the office has never provided advice on the economic or social effects of a bill. Until about ten years ago, the office did provide a substantial amount of legal advice on proposed bills. In the last ten years, however, this work has dwindled until no formal requests for legal advice are now received. This change is undoubtedly due to the establishment and expansion of House Research and Senate Counsel which provide legal advice to members and committees of their respective houses. The provision could be repealed.

Function:

- publishing Actions, the yearly summary of legislative bills enacted into law.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by House Reserach and Senate Counsel which formerly published Actions).

Performance:

The goal of publishing Actions of the 1982 Legislature in a timely fashion was met. The work on Actions to get it ready for printing was done within 60 days of the end of the 1982 regular session. Actions was available for distribution to the public within 90 days of the end of the First Special Session.

The format for Actions remained essentially the same as it was in the past. New subject headings were added to the table of contents to facilitate finding the summaries.

Function:

- upon request of a standing committee of the House, preparing a Revisor's analysis of a bill.

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); House Rule 6.4.

Performance:

The House Rules have provided for a Revisor's analysis of bills since 1969. It was apparently intended that the Revisor's staff, who originally drafted bills, also provide a summary of its content. Shortly after the rule was adopted a few committees requested the preparation of a Revisor's analysis on a few bills. None have been requested for at least ten years. The service of providing bill summaries is now provided by House Research, and to a lesser extent, by caucus staffs. As a result, this provision of the House Rules could be dropped.

Function:

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

Source of Mandate: Minnesota Statutes 1980, section 482.09, clause (9); custom and usage of the Legislature (requested by the LCRAR).

Performance:

One attorney in the Revisor's office was assigned as primary counsel for the LCRAR along with that attorney's other drafting duties. Several other attorneys in the office also provided advice related to specific subject areas when the need arose. Counsel was present at all meetings of the LCRAR and reviewed numerous staff reports at the director's request. Counsel prepared formal legal memoranda on some occasions and gave informal oral advice often. Counsel also assisted the LCRAR by reviewing proposed legislation affecting its responsibilities.

The LCRAR has no staff other than the director and a secretary, so the addition of legal assistance by this office has been important to its functioning.

Section 3

Performance Achievements Outside Goals and Functions

While the achievement of preset goals is one method of judging the office's performance, it is not the only way. In many other areas, the office has made improvements, changes, and corrections. These are set out on the following pages.

Budget Reductions: During the past 18 months, the office went through four rounds of budget reductions resulting in a total reduction in excess of 20 percent of the budget originally requested. A side effect has been that the Revisor, personally, has been working almost continuously with budgetary problems. This necessitated weighing of the effect of alternative reductions, preparing appropriate recommendations, and taking action to insure expenditures were within the budget. Because the reductions essentially left the office without any reserve for unexpected expenditures, the difficulties in maintaining the budget in the black were continuous.

The office has responded to the state's austere financial picture while maintaining services at a high level.

User Satisfaction: For many years it was believed that there were significant user satisfaction problems with the office. This was caused by the creation of several other staff offices whose functions duplicated a portion of the statutory mandate to the Revisor and the repetitive public blame by legislators and staff assigned to the office for various legislative problems.

However, statistical study indicates that there is no trend to transfer work to staff offices offering competitive services. Also, the office has received public complements on the quality of its work. While there is still some griping, at least the complements and brickbats have seemed to balance out.