

811722

S. 1972

PERFORMANCE REPORT
ON THE
OFFICE OF THE REVISOR OF STATUTES
FOR THE PERIOD
JULY 1, 1980 - JUNE 30, 1981

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

September 1, 1981

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;
- 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 and Minnesota Statutes together with indexes and a wide variety of tables;
- compiling and publishing Minnesota Rules together with an index and finding aids;
- accumulating data on the operation and effect of laws in other states;
- indexing bills and resolutions introduced;
- maintaining files of all documents prepared by the Revisor's staff;
- preparing special bills to revise laws as directed by a legislative committee;
- 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;
- 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;

- drafting conference committee reports;
- developing and maintaining a computer system for use by the Revisor's Office and other legislative agencies for the production of legislative documents;
- 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;
- upon request assisting Senate and House staff to prepare new systems for their use;
- 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;
- providing legal assistance to the Legislative Committee to Review Administrative Rules; and,
- upon request of a standing committee of the House, preparing a Revisor's analysis of a bill.

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 table on the following pages. Examination of the table shows that the Revisor's Office has continued to produce a high volume of work for the Legislature. Several significant facts can be gleaned from the tables. First, the percentage of enrolled bills whose primary drafting source was the Revisor's Office has risen steadily since 1975 when that information was first collected. Second, the session law pages for 1981 alone will almost equal the number of session law pages for both 1979 and 1980. Even though the number of laws enacted in 1981 was 60% of the previous two-year total, the number of new statutory sections in 1981 was 75% of the previous two-year total, because the enacted chapters were, on the average, 50% longer than in the 1979-1980 period. In other words, while the Legislature enacted less laws, they were far longer than prior years resulting in more editorial work for the office. Third, the number of bill comparisons, a particularly difficult task, also took a large jump during the session. 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 third 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 eleven difficult goals for the year and did a remarkably good job at meeting them. In the second section, many other specific accomplishments are listed.

REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

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>Engrossments</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	*	1411	*
1976	1541	*	*	*	1654	*	907	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>5224</u>	<u>2645</u>	<u>51%</u>	<u>559</u>	<u>5297</u>	*	<u>2318</u>	*
1977	3301	*	*	388	3268	197	1324	*
1978	1418	*	*	*	1680	171	975	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>4719</u>	<u>3049</u>	<u>65%</u>	*	<u>4948</u>	<u>368</u>	<u>2299</u>	*
1979	3267	1998	61%	425	3249	138	1078	49
Special	8	3		0	3	0	0	0
1980	1571	974	62%	454	1692	180	892	55
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>4846</u>	<u>2975</u>	<u>61%</u>	<u>879</u>	<u>4944</u>	<u>318</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>104</u>
1981	2901	1817	63%	395	3018	227	1021	72
Specials	35	18	51%	10	27	0	0	0
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>2936</u>	<u>1835</u>	<u>59%</u>	<u>405</u>	<u>3045</u>	<u>227</u>	<u>1021</u>	<u>72</u>

(1981 Only)

*=Statistics not available

REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

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								
Special	3	1297	3.78	757	1233	508	389	0	2130
1980	283	1621	5.73	10,704	1606	838	598	0	3042
<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	369	} 2738							
Specials	12		7.19	*	2522	975	875	25	4397
<u>TOTAL</u>	<u>381</u>								
(1981 Only)									

*=Statistics Not Available

REVISOR OF STATUTES
YEARLY PRODUCTION STATISTICS

ENGROSSING AND ENROLLING OPERATIONS

<u>Session Year</u>	<u>Engrossed House Bills</u>	<u>Engrossed Senate Bills</u>	<u>Unofficial House Engrossments</u>	<u>Unofficial Senate Engrossments</u>	<u>Total Engrossments</u>	<u>House Enrollments</u>	<u>Senate Enrollments</u>	<u>Total Enrollments</u>	<u>Vetoes</u>	<u>Senate & House Resolutions Enrolled</u>
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	494	584	65	7	1078	194	151	345	5	3
Special	1					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	388	633	26	14	1021	195	194	389	7	3
Specials	8	1	0	0	9	2	3	5	1	1
TOTAL	396	634	26	14	1030	197	197	394	8	4
(1981 Only)										

*=Statistics Not Available

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	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<u>Special</u>	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<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>	157 (20%)	226 (29%)	108 (14%)	5 (1%)	32 (4%)	54 (7%)	203 (26%)	785
1977	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
1978	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
<u>TOTAL</u>	283 (36%)	250 (31%)	132 (17%)	30 (4%)	38 (5%)	33 (4%)	28 (4%)	794
1979	127	106	23	15	31	33	0	335
<u>Special</u>	115	82	48	13	21	4	0	283
<u>1980</u>	242 (39%)	188 (30%)	71 (11%)	28 (5%)	52 (8%)	37 (6%)	0 (0%)	618
1981 Regular & Specials	182 (48%)	44 (12%)	74 (19%)	20 (5%)	29 (8%)	32 (8%)	0 (0%)	381

#=Not necessarily the original drafting source

*Statistics Not Available

Section 1

Specific Factors: Goal Completion

Last year the Revisor's Office set up eleven specific office goals. Five were to be completed within one 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 one year goals have been met and describes the progress made on the two year goals.

Goal 1:

Drafting back-up and drafting cooperation. All attorneys will divide their bill drafting subject or subjects among the other attorneys so all drafting subjects have backup drafters. All attorneys will work out a system by which backup attorneys will review and assist on important bill drafts. (One-year goal.)

Performance:

Initial work on dividing drafting subjects to provide for backup assistance was begun before the 1981 session. Because of the press of work during the session, work was not completed until after the session. All drafting subject areas have now been assigned to a backup attorney, and, in the case of subjects which are especially complex or are the source of numerous requests, a second and third backup have been provided.

It is expected that the backup attorneys will provide a source of short-term advice and assistance for the office's attorneys and ensure that the Legislature is protected in case a drafter is suddenly unavailable.

During personal interviews most of the attorneys reported an increasing level of consultation or cooperation on drafting complex bills.

Conclusion:

Goal completed.

Goal 2:

Engrossing and Enrolling. A processing sheet for engrossing and enrolling which will be "initialed-off" by bill drafting assistants, supervisors, and attorneys will be developed and used as a standard operating procedure. All sheets for all engrossments and enrollments during the session will be completed. No substantive errors to be found in any enrolled bill after approval by the Governor. (One-year goal.)

Performance:

A revised engrossing folder, incorporating a processing form to be used by supervisors, bill drafting assistants, and attorneys was developed and used during the session. It proved to be very successful. It helped the new bill drafting assistants and refreshed the memories of the experienced staff. It required all staff working on an engrossment or enrollment to "initial-off" and thereby take responsibility for the accuracy of their work.

New folders and rolodex cards were used which were more concise and allowed extra room for subsequent engrossments.

Different color folders were used for unofficial engrossments and enrollments, enabling the staff to see at a glance the files with which they were working. While a deceptively simple change, it also prevented lost time by keeping the papers together without using paper clips.

The Legislative Terminal Facility at the State Office Building was supervised by engrossing and enrolling supervisors. The operation of the facility during the session was a success primarily due to the choice of personnel. The staff at the facility was highly praised by Senate Counsel and House Majority and Minority staff. The staff worked well despite being largely on their own. The LTF staff prepared 125 amendments and 42 unofficial engrossments. These numbers were not included in the totals at the front of this report since reviewed by the office's professional drafting staff. However, this work represents significant assistance to the Legislature. The help of the LTF staff in preparing committee reports minimized problems when a committee report was ultimately engrossed into a bill.

All procedures for engrossing and enrolling were written. This included both the office's internal procedures and the procedures for delivering enrolled bills to the Governor. These procedures helped to define the responsibility of everyone who deals with an engrossment or enrollment.

All acts that were sent to the Governor were error free.

Conclusion:

Goal completed.

Goal 3:

Bill Drafting Assistant Training. All bill drafting assistants will be trained on all possible input operations. (One-year goal.)

Performance:

An effort was made by the supervisors to give additional training to bill drafting assistants on more phases of the Revisor's operations. This came about, in part, because of necessity. Bill drafting operations were short of supervisory help in the late fall before the 1981 session, and work piled up. Bill drafting assistants had to be trained in phases of work which had formerly been done by supervisory staff.

The most obvious change came about in the preparation of comparisons for the Senate and House. Clear and concise instructions for compiling and inputting comparisons were prepared. Several bill drafting assistants were trained on preparing comparisons.

More people worked on tables, indexes, Actions, and unformatted material during the past year. This work involved use of new types of coding and a procedure different from inputting bill drafts.

Conclusion:

Goal partially completed. While the goal of training bill drafting assistants on all possible input operations was not completely achieved, significant progress was made.

Goal 4:

Publication of Supplement. The Minnesota Statutes 1981 Supplement will be printed in a form matching Minnesota Statutes 1980 rather than the form of prior Supplements and the index form revised to solely reflect new law. It will be published no later than 120 days after the session. (One-year goal.)

Performance:

Work on the publication of Minnesota Statutes 1981 Supplement is in progress as of the date of this report. All tapes will be delivered to the vendor by the end of August. The Supplement index has been keyboarded and editorial revision is now in progress. The computer tape of the index should be delivered in early September. To accomplish the delivery of the Supplement by November 2, 1981 (120 days after the end of the second special session), all material should be in the hands of the printer by October 2, 1981. Barring any problems in composition or printing, this goal will be accomplished well within the goal.

The performance of the editorial staff has been excellent. All internal work has been performed smoothly and accurately. With the preparatory work for Session Laws complete, all attention is now directed to the Supplement.

The work on the Supplement is facilitated by several batch computer programs. The primary one is the SUPSORT program. It works from Table II which shows the statutory coding and the session law chapters and sections which create, amend, or repeal the statutory section to automatically print out all affected sections in the proper order and with changes incorporated. Programs are also used to update the statutory data bases and for indexing. Without these programs, the work on the Supplement would take a great deal longer and be more subject to human error.

The form of the Supplement has been changed to conform to that of Minnesota Statutes 1980. The anomaly of the Supplement being printed in a different typographic form than the work it supplements will, at last, end.

The index, however, will remain in the form of indexing the content of sections amended and not just changes occurring during the session. The change was not undertaken because other work took a higher priority. Among that other work was the indexing effort devoted to indexing the administrative rules and the decision to delay substantive changes in statutory indexing until after the rules work is completed.

Conclusion:

Goal completed except for the change in the indexing of the Supplement. This change proved to be impossible due to the press of other work.

Goal 5:

Publication of Session Laws. The Laws of Minnesota 1981 will be published no later than 90 days after the end of the session. (One-year goal.)

Performance:

Work on the publication of Laws of Minnesota 1981 is currently in progress as of the date of this report. The target date for receiving the publication is on or about October 2, 1981 (90 days from the end of the second special session ending July 2, 1981).

Some problems have been encountered with the current vendor in the composition of the unformatted data for this publication. After several meetings the vendor's difficulties have, hopefully, been resolved. Barring any future difficulty in setting the tables and index, the Session Laws should still be delivered within the goal time.

Editorial staff performance in this area has also been excellent. Delivery to the vendor of all text, front matter, and tables was accomplished within three weeks after the end of the second special session. The index is complete.

The timely completion of the work on Laws must be considered together with the monumental size of this year's publication. Following the trend in the size of Laws, before the 1981 session it was predicted that the 1981 edition would be about 1200 pages in length. Instead, it will be more than 2700 pages. The increase was due to the increased size of bills enacted by the Legislature, not to an artificial change in typography. Despite the increased size, the 90-day goal was not relaxed. It appears that it will be met.

Conclusion:

It appears at present that delivery will still be timely, so the goal will be completed. If there are any time problems, they can be attributed to the outside vendor, not to the fault of the Revisor's staff. In fact, the speedy performance of the staff early in the process provided the excess time for completion of the work despite the contractor's delays.

Goal 6:

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

Performance:

The office staff accomplished the following work relating to recompilation and drafting of Administrative Rules during the 1980-1981 fiscal year:

(1) a contract has been made with Electronic Keyboarding Incorporated to put all existing state agency rules on a magnetic tape. The staff worked with EKI to resolve the technical procedures to implement the contract;

(2) because the text of the administrative rules is of greater complexity than present documents, the existing text management program was modified to be able to handle the increased complexity;

(3) staff searched out existing state rules and prepared that data base for keyboarding - in the process, the staff analyzed and resolved numerous conflicts between different texts of the same rule numbers;

(4) substantially all of the keyboarding of the state's Administrative Rules was completed by an outside contractor under close supervision by the Revisor's staff;

(5) the staff prepared and followed a bill to clarify the duties of the Revisor's Office in the drafting and recompilation of Administrative Rules;

(6) the staff copied the Secretary of State's Administrative Rules files so the office could use the information in preparing both the text and finding aids for Minnesota Rules;

(7) the staff prepared a temporary rule drafting guide and held its first rule drafting seminar for state agencies;

(8) internal procedures for processing and keyboarding rule drafting requests were established;

(9) filing systems were established to keep track of the recompilation work;

(10) five new attorneys and one writing specialist were hired to begin work on the recompilation;

(11) substantial progress was made on determining rule histories;

(12) the existing rules were tentatively divided into chapters and preliminary decisions were made on recompilation instructions;

(13) preliminary progress was made in working out with a legal publishing firm an agreement for indexing of Minnesota Rules;

(14) the office completed or began work on 56 rule requests; and,

(15) the rules staff prepared for other staff an unofficial engrossment of laws relating to rule drafting and recompilation.

Conclusion:

Goal accomplished.

Goal 7:

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. (Two-year goal.)

Performance:

Necessary funds to reindex Minnesota Statutes were included in the office's budget request. However, budget cuts have ruled out reindexing by a contractor of Minnesota Statutes 1982. Instead, a plan for improvement of Minnesota Statutes 1982 will be developed by the Assistant Revisor for indexing. Work on it will commence when the 1981 Supplement index is completed. The plan will incorporate improvements with the recognition that (1) it is unknown whether or not Minnesota Statutes 1984 will be reindexed by a contractor, (2) the Minnesota Rules index will be available in the fall of 1982, and (3) Minnesota Rules and Minnesota Statutes indexes should be compatible in form and style.

Indexing standards were established as a part of the preparation for the indexing of Minnesota Rules. The same standards will be used for the indexing of Minnesota Statutes whether that work is done by an outside contractor or within the office. Procedures to coordinate and control the ongoing indexing process of the Statutes will be included as part of the plan for improvement for Minnesota Statutes 1982.

Conclusion:

Although the complete reindexing by a contractor of Minnesota Statutes 1982 will not occur because of budget cuts, significant improvements in the existing index will be made.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OF MINNESOTA

Goal 8:

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. (Two-year goal.)

Performance:

The office has maintained consistent liaison with the Public Law Research Center of the Hamline University School of Law to see the completion of this project. The Revisor assisted on the preparation of proposals to three different foundations to obtain funds to match a state grant for the special laws project. At the end of the year, the Bush Foundation provided the necessary funds. A project director has been selected and the entire effort will shortly get underway. It is expected that the special laws index in Minnesota Statutes 1982 will include all special laws ever enacted in the state.

In addition, the existing table was input into the computer data base, and research on the first five years of special laws was substantially completed. This work should provide a firm base for completing the full project.

Between providing the footing for the project to be completed and obtaining the funding to complete research on the special laws, the progress has been significant. The project will be concluded in time for inclusion in next year's Statutes.

Conclusion:

Goal completed.

Goal 9:

Computer Services. To the extent appropriations permit, make appropriate progress on implementing recommendations of Consultant's Computer Study. (Two-year goal.)

Performance:

After completion of the Consultants' Report in January, a series of meetings was held to plan appropriate responses. As a result of the issues mentioned in the report, the following advances were made in the Revisor's computer services during the year:

- (1) a computer services group was formed within the revisor's office;
- (2) the print quality of bills was improved through the use of newer technology printers;
- (3) the Senate Journal was computerized for the 1981 session;
- (4) the Administrative Rules data base was built with codes compatible with the Revisor's computer system;
- (5) work has begun to find replacement terminals;
- (6) work has begun to lower the cost of computer time for the on-line system;
- (7) development work and steps are being documented; and,
- (8) a program was developed to analyze internal cross-references in the Statutes.

Conclusion:

Goal completed. Considering the amount of staff available, development of the computer services has been excellent. The progress must still continue, particularly in the area of documenting the programs and replacing the terminals now being used.

Goal 10:

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. (Two-year goal.)

Performance:

This goal concerns publication of Minnesota Statutes 1982, but some preliminary work has been done.

Publication of cross-references after each section would require additional procedures and time during the editorial cycle of the office. Advance consideration has been given to the method of implementing this goal. It was determined that the expenditure of staff resources to accomplish it, particularly in the year when the initial recompilation of the rules is also underway, would be more than could reasonably be expected. This part of Goal 10 is not practical for Minnesota Statutes 1982. However, the information will be set in improved tabular form.

Plans have been made for the addition of headnotes to all subdivisions of the statutes. Headnotes can be supplied to all subdivisions and existing headnotes reviewed. This work will be assigned to attorneys and begun as soon as possible. Headnotes should be written on copy and be available for entry when editing of Minnesota Statutes 1982 begins. Some of this has been accomplished in the course of bill drafting. Consideration will be given to the propriety of exceptions, possibly for short definition subdivisions.

Conclusion:

Cross-references will probably be published in 1982 in substantially similar form to their publication in 1980. Headnotes will be supplied for the 1982 edition.

Goal 11:

Style and Form Redrafts of Chapters. Include style and form redrafts in 1981 and 1982 Revisor's bills submitted to the Legislature. (Two-year goal.)

Performance:

For many years the content of the annual Revisor's bill has been restricted to technical changes. However, from the history of statutory revision in Minnesota, including the establishment of the Revisor's Office, it is clear that the bills were intended to be broader in purpose.

Two new kinds of material were incorporated in this year's bill. The first was a correction of faulty cross-references in the statutes. This was done by using a computer to search all cross-references and then determining whether there were any mistakes in them.

The second was a style and form revision of two separate chapters of Minnesota Statutes. One dealt with small loans, and the other with animals.

Both types of material were accepted as a proper part of the Revisor's bill. Plans are now being made for further style and form revisions in the future.

Conclusion:

Goal completed. The bills were introduced and all but one passed. (The one which did not was voluntarily withdrawn because it was in conflict with a substantive bill which had passed.) This important function should now become a permanent feature of the revisor's work.

Section 2

Performance Achievements Outside Goals

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 reform:

During the past session the Legislature appropriated funds for the 1981-1983 fiscal biennium. In the course of the appropriations process, the Revisor sought and obtained two crucial changes in the manner in which appropriations to the office were made.

First, the revolving fund for paying publication costs connected with publication of Minnesota Statutes and Laws was abolished. Instead, funds were appropriated directly to pay these costs. The change was necessary because the revolving fund didn't "revolve." The receipts were set in relation to current costs, but each successive year costs increase. For that reason it was difficult to pay bills until after receipts from sales of the printed books were received.

Second, the statutory formula specifying the manner of determining the sales price of Minnesota Statutes was changed. Formerly, the price had to be sufficient to pay all publishing costs. But, since only half of the copies printed were sold (the other half were given away free to various governmental offices and employees), the sales price was unnecessarily inflated. In effect, those who bought the books were subsidizing those who got them free. Also, the artificially inflated sales price cut down on sales.

The two changes represent important modernization of the office's budgetary procedures.

Conclusion:

The office exercised initiative to modernize the budgetary process of the office.

Budget:

The amount of \$1,604,403 was appropriated to the Revisor's Office for expenses connected with fiscal year 1981. This amount excludes approximately \$600,000 in expenditures and receipts from the statutory publications revolving fund. Preliminary figures for the closing balance for the fiscal year indicate that the office will finish the year with a modest balance. That accomplishment must be considered with the fact that for half the fiscal year the office incurred extensive additional costs connected with the new administrative rules project. Those costs were particularly heavy because they included the costs to equip the new office with all furniture and supplies. In order to allow for these additional costs, savings had to be achieved in most of the office's other functions. The savings were achieved primarily by reducing personnel costs, consultant services costs, and computer system costs.

Conclusion:

The Revisor's Office was operated within the financial limitations imposed by the Legislature despite imposition of additional duties without additional funds.

User Satisfaction:

It has been a source of concern in the past that little positive reaction was given in response to the office's work. Some adverse comments were heard in the course of conversations with legislators or floor debate. This past year has brought a seeming reversal of that pattern. Numerous appreciative and complimentary responses were given to the office's work. Most were oral, but some were in writing. While it is difficult to determine whether either the prior unfavorable reactions or the more recent positive reactions are based on a demonstrable change in the office, the positive reinforcement had a positive effect on office morale.

In addition, numerous favorable comments were received from a variety of sources on the changes in format of Minnesota Statutes. While it was believed that the changes made the publication more useful, it was thought that some people would prefer the familiar form rather than a better form. The favorable response will lead to more improvements in the future.

Conclusion:

There has been a significant improvement in the nature of unsolicited comments upon the office's work.

Utilization:

One possible measure of the effectiveness of the office's work is to ascertain the quantity of work done by the Revisor's staff in comparison to the quantity of work done by other legislative staff offices offering similar services. Since legislators can have drafting work done by any of several staff groups, any trend in the proportion of who does the work would indicate the perception of legislators as to the quality of work done.

In the table "Enrolled Bills - Primary Drafting Source" at the beginning of this report is shown the primary drafting source of bills enacted into law. Over the past few years there has been a modest increase in the percentage of bills enacted into law which were substantially prepared by Revisor's attorneys. More important is the fact that there is no dramatic shift of work away from the Revisor's Office.

Conclusion:

The stability of the relative number of bills drafted by the Revisor's staff relative to other staff indicates user satisfaction with the work performed.