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The Joint Interim Committee approved insertion of the following statement:

"Many of the recommendations of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, including the one immediately above, appear to be more applicable to annual sessions. While the members of the Joint Interim Committee approve of them in principle, they deemed it best to reserve comment until annual sessions are adopted."

12. Consolidation of Senate-House Service Facilities

To the full extent compatible with efficient operation, the maintenance of dual facilities and staffs for the performance of service activities applicable to both branches of the legislature should be eliminated. As beginning steps, consolidation of the following is recommended:

a. Senate and House bill rooms and bill distribution functions.
b. Senate and House mailroom operations.
c. Senate and House engrossing and enrolling staffs and activities.

C. CONCLUSION

It is believed that if the recommendations made in this Part IV are adopted that they will go a long way towards accomplishing the objectives described in the beginning of this report.

IV

LEGISLATIVE FACILITIES

The Joint Interim Legislative Committee on Facilities and Operations adopted the following report as expanded by its observations and recommendations on page 68.

A. INTRODUCTION

Just as a private business enterprise furnishes appropriate housing and office facilities for its employees in order that maximum effective use may be made of their talents and capacities, so a state must provide proper physical facilities to make maximum effective use of the talents of its legislators.

The subject of physical facilities logically falls into two parts. The grouping and planning of buildings devoted to legislative purposes and, secondly, the physical planning necessary to enable maximum effective use to be made of such buildings.

In January, 1966, certain members of the Joint Interim Committee on Facilities and Operations of the Washington State Legislature, accompanied by the chairman and the then director of the Citizens Advisory Committee, made a tour of the capitol buildings in the capitals of California, New Mexico, Texas, Florida and South Carolina. During the course of the trip, the group was joined by legislators from other states including Missouri, Illinois and South Carolina, with a review session held in the new capitol building at Columbia, South Carolina. Certain conclusions were reached concerning considerations that should be borne in mind for legislative facilities planning in the State of Washington. Without attempting a statement of the order of importance, they may be briefly summarized as follows:

The buildings in which the Legislature is to work might properly include the following facilities:

1. Provision for private accessibility to and exit from the building by the legislators.
2. Provision for adequate office space for the legislator and his staff. In that connection, the minimum staff should be a secretary. A stenographer taken from a pool is not too satisfactory or efficient. Preferably, the space should be sufficient to include provision for an administrative assistant or research person, as in California.
3. Provision must provide adequate space for meetings of both the House and Senate.
4. Provision must be had for an adequate number of hearing rooms with facilities to accommodate up to 500 persons.
5. Provision should be made to provide adequate space for legislative tools, including working library, legislative counsel, data-processing facilities, legislative research, including staff for persons engaged therein.
6. Provision must be made to provide for adequate parking for legislators and, at least to a limited extent, for persons seeking to contact the legislators.
7. Provision should be made for a legislative members' lounge.
8. Provision should be made for a central meeting place for those who have business with the legislators, e.g., lobbyists. In that connection, it should be noted that lobbyists do furnish a legitimate function. An open recognition of the legitimacy of their function might go far to increase the image of respectability and legimitacy (subject, of course, to proper controls).
9. Provision should be made for facilities for press, television and radio.
10. Provision should be made for the use of automatic voting mechanisms and intercommunication facilities between the legislator and his secretary and between appropriate legislative officials and the speaker or presiding officer or committee chairman and the Governor.
11. Provision should be made for adequate observation by the public, including adequate balcony room in the House and Senate.
12. Provision should be made for expandability of the legislative building for at least a 25-year period.
13. Provision should be made for a private dining room for the legislators to enable them to protect their privacy or to meet one another conveniently in the transaction of legislative business.
14. Although none of the buildings visited contained all the facilities above enumerated, some contained more than others. California probably contained more facilities of the kind enumerated than the others. Nevertheless, each capitol or legislative building had some features not enjoyed by others.
15. As a result of the inspections made and the persons interviewed, it became increasingly obvious that it is false economy to deprive legislators of the help they need to discharge their duties. The public has become accustomed to providing adequate mechanical and personal help for their judges and their executives and administrators. It seems that legislators have responsibilities and obligations at least equal to those enjoyed by the other branches of government. They have the onerous burden of determining policy and setting the course and direction of the state in its future internal and external relationships. Surely, it is a mistake not to give the legislators all the help
they need in discharging these obligations. It would be our hope, therefore, that in any building program undertaken in this state, the legislature and the public would feel that expenditures to provide the facilities needed are not expenses, but investments.

B. GENERAL CAMPUS PLAN—RECOMMENDATIONS

As long ago as 1928, a plan was formulated known as the Wilder and White plan concerning the location of the capitol group of buildings on the campus at the state capitol in Olympia, Washington. In a special study undertaken under the chairmanship of Mr. K. Winslow with President Charles Odegaard of the University of Washington and Paul Thiry, distinguished architect who had long been associated as consultant to the Capitol Committee consisting of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor and Land Commissioner, consideration was given to whether the Wilder and White plan should be continued. As a result of their deliberations, they made the following recommendations:

1. That the original Wilder & White plan, dated 1928, be retained and kept in force without modification.
2. That present State Capitol group of buildings be adapted for the primary use of the Legislative, Executive and Judicial functions of state government.
3. That underground parking facilities be provided in the area south of the Capitol and north of the building occupied by the Judiciary.
4. That the present Governor's House be removed and a new structure be erected overlooking the Des Chutes Basin, in keeping with the personal requirements of the Chief Executive and the public use of such a facility as contemplated in the Wilder & White plan.
5. The space made available by removal of the present Governor's House be held in reserve for a future expansion of the classical Capitol group of buildings for which provision is made in the original Wilder & White plan.
6. That all administrative offices other than the office of General Administration be located on the campus being developed on land east of Capitol Way, so as not to detract from the appearance of the Capitol group of buildings and the landscaped area which it presently occupies.

The Citizens Advisory Committee approves the foregoing recommendations.

C. LEGISLATIVE OFFICE PLAN

It has long been known that office facilities for legislators are wholly inadequate. There are some private offices in the Legislative Building but they are far from adequate in providing the necessary privacy that a legislator should have to do his most effective work. Even the committee rooms are inadequate. Back of the legislative buildings there are two buildings known as the Public Health Building and the Public Lands Building that can be utilized to provide the necessary private office space in an overall program of improving the space requirements for committees and for legislators and legislative personnel.

Conscious of the need for these improvements, the Capitol Committee (consisting of the Governor, Lt. Governor and the Commissioner of Public Lands) approved a resolution of the Joint Interim Committee on Facilities and Operations of the Washington State Legislature to undertake the necessary remodeling and to provide the necessary furnishings to accomplish this task. A description of these facilities, together with an estimate of costs, are set forth in Exhibit A attached to this Part V of the Report. The project includes remodeling work on the Legislative Building and the top floors of the Public Health Building and Public Lands Building. The furnishings will be needed for the private offices but will, in part, replace furnishings that need replacement. Since the estimate was prepared, remodeling contracts have been let for a total price of $470,800 and, at this writing, bids will be opened shortly to provide furnishings, the preliminary estimate of the cost of which is $266,965. Cost will be incurred to move out and house some of the state agencies that formerly occupied the space to be used for legislators' offices. It is expected that the improvements and furnishings will be available for use by the members of the 1967 session of the Washington State Legislature. The Citizens Advisory Committee believes that the proposed expenditures are relatively modest and should be made in the public's interest. It reaffirms the recommendation it had heretofore made to the Capitol Committee to proceed with the recommended improvements and recommended acquisition of the necessary furnishings.

D. DATA PROCESSING—RECOMMENDATIONS

It scarcely needs any argument to urge the use of modern techniques and equipment in the handling of legislative business. The Council of State Government had the following to say concerning the use of technological devices and processes to increase the efficiency of legislative bodies.

"Legislatures and legislative staff should explore the wide range and variety of the new and other technological devices and processes now available with the view to adapting many of them to various aspects of the legislative process—roll-call voting, reproduction of legislative measures, preparation of the journals, recording of hearings and debates, and in other applications.

"Institutions as venerable as parliamentary bodies have a tendency to resist change, even when change can expedite the institutional processes and free the participants for closer attention to their primary tasks. The advances of technology in our time have resulted in the availability of mechanical and electrical equipment which can be applied at many stages of the legislative process. These include dictating "jacks" at the desks of individual legislators, speedy methods for recording roll-call votes, automatic typewriters and teletypewriter devices which speed and render less costly and time-consuming the reproduction of legislative materials of various types, and other devices.

"The application of these new devices to many phases of the legislative process can be very great indeed. Reproduction devices now available and in widespread use make possible the duplication and distribution of material within a matter of minutes, and this Committee suggests that an imaginative effort by each legislature to adapt new technological methods to the legislative process is likely to be most rewarding.

"The matter of legislative reporting is especially relevant in this connection. As a general proposition, it must be acknowledged that reports mirroring official action by the legislature and by its committees fall far short of the ideal. When the public lacks authoritative information as to the steps and the reasoning by which a legislative body has reached its conclusion,

---

1. Since the writing of this report, firm bids have been accepted in the approximate amount of the architect's estimate.
public regard for the body itself suffers. Most legislative councils and interim legislative research bodies have taken pains to document the process by which their conclusions were reached; this Committee urges the legislatures to consider making similar arrangements for maintaining and making available comparable records covering the period when the legislature is in session.

“The Committee urges all legislative bodies to explore the possible uses of these devices so that the legislative process can be expedited, the legislature can be enabled to handle more efficiently the mounting volume of business facing it, and the public can be better informed.”—The Council of State Governments, American State Legislatures in Mid-Twentieth Century: Final Report of the Committee on Legislative Processes and Procedures of the National Legislative Conference (April 1961), 19-20.

The foregoing statement of The Council of State Government’s committee is strongly recommended as a guide for action by the Washington legislature.

One of the great technological advances increasingly used in large private businesses is the use of computers. There is no question that computer services could greatly increase the efficiency of the legislature with resulting savings in time and with a substantially increased accurate processing of legislative material. Such use of computers is especially important in the case of a part-time legislature with limited sessions and limited staff resources to accomplish a great deal more during sessions and even between sessions. The Citizens Advisory Committee has not yet been able to determine the cost of utilizing computer services and more detailed study will be required before a final conclusion is reached. However, there are certain recommendations that can be made at this time, looking to the utilization of computer services as part of the central computer facilities being consolidated by the State Data Processing Coordinator. The plan calls for a central location for all of the computer technology of Olympia that would utilize a massive computer (or computers) and a central filing system that would provide information to all agencies using the system.

The legislature could use this facility not only during session but the services could also be available to the interim or standing committees between sessions. Such services would enlarge the scope of research for personnel not residing in Olympia. In Olympia, they could locate in a few hours what might otherwise take days of research through libraries and other sources.

With the foregoing in mind, the Citizens Advisory Committee makes the following tentative general recommendations (with a special recommendation to follow):

1. For the present, any additional implementations of computer facilities should be incorporated into the centralized computer system envisioned to serve not only the legislature, but all state agencies planned under the supervision of the State Data Processing Coordinator.
2. A legal retrieval computer (wherein statutes are committed to computer memory) should be effected. The following categories of information should be included within the “memory” of the computer:
   a. Statutes (Revised Code of Washington)
   b. Attorney General Opinions
   c. Court Decisions
   d. Administrative Rulings
3. The automatic type-setting computer which has been ordered by the State Printer should be linked to the legal retrieval system wherein statutes could be retrieved and typed in one operation.

4. An Administrative Terminal System (ATS) typewriter, commonly known as a “memory” typewriter, should be purchased and linked to a computer for the purpose of quickly revising bill drafts without the necessity of retyping the bill in its entirety.
5. The legislature should sponsor a thoroughgoing study of devices which may be effectively utilized to provide information relating to its proceedings and actions to its members and staff, to officials of state and local government, and to the public. A legislature has the duty of maintaining complete, current and accurate information pertaining to legislative developments and the status of all legislative proposals. This means that it must periodically publish such information in meaningful and useful form and in a manner suitable to the circumstances of different kinds of interested parties.

“All indexing services should be done under the control of the legislature, by its own personnel. Reliance on private agencies for the provision of this service should be avoided, for legislative action should not be dependent, for effective accomplishment, on private actions. If presently performed by an executive agency, these services should be transferred to legislative control at such time and by such methods as will cause no loss in the quality of service.

“Optimum or even adequate indexing service demands trained and skilled staff. The legislative employees performing this service should be reorganized on the basis of competence, and should be adequately compensated, to insure quality service.”—Council of State Governments, Mr. President . . . Mr. Speaker: Report of the Committee on Organization of Legislative Services of the National Legislative Conference (January 1963)

The foregoing comment is equally applicable to all types of informational services which the legislature should provide itself.

In this connection, attention is directed to the plan now operative in Florida of broadcasting through data processing equipment information relating to status of bills, public hearings and other legislative actions to key points in that state.

6. If the above recommendations cannot be agreed on at this time, without further study, then funds should be appropriated by action of the forthcoming legislature to study the legal retrieval program. The areas of bill drafting, indexing, and printing could be considered as logical extensions of the retrieval process.

7. Such a study should be a joint effort of the legislature, attorney general, members of the Washington State Bar Association and the State Coordinator for Data Processing.

E. CLERICAL AND STAFF FACILITIES

It is obvious that staff organization is essential in the organization of the legislature so that legislators can do their jobs properly and advisedly. The Citizens Advisory Committee has certain recommendations to make in this area. For ease in presentation, the recommendations are divided into two categories. The short-range recommendations are based upon the assumption that the Legislature will continue to function as basically a part-time biennial body. The long-range recommendations are predicated upon the premise that the Legislature may gradually approach a full-time type of operation.
F. CLERICAL STAFF DURING SESSION

1. Selection
The Legislature hires employees for the duration of each legislative session. The diversity of skills required is reflected in Exhibit B, which outlines the various classifications utilized. Because of the interesting nature of the work and the salary premiums, there are relatively few problems involved regarding labor supply. The major sources of employees are:
   a. Patronage assignments.
   b. Local Olympia residents.
   c. Merit system employees “borrowed” from Olympia-based state agencies for the duration of the session.
An additional source, untapped to date, is the wives and families of servicemen based at Fort Lewis.
Mechanically, patronage and recruiting is reviewed by the Employment Committee of each House and recruiting efforts and assignments are within the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House.
The use of tests and selection techniques, other than a brief interview, is not feasible because of the rapid build-up which is required and the short duration of the sessions.

2. Utilization
The major problem regarding staff utilization in the past has been the limited amount of space available to the Legislature. The proposal last recommended under the heading of “Legislative Office Plan” should substantially alleviate this problem.
The new facilities layout will enable the Legislature to virtually eliminate the rather awkward and unwieldy steno pool and also provide for a more personal and effective administration of employee activities by the individual legislators. Plans for the next session include a joint switchboard-telephone service which will reduce the traffic and security problems on the respective House floors.
No evidence was found to indicate that the overall competency of the staff does not meet the requirements of the Legislature. However, certain problems which are inherent in a patronage system were evident. The two major problems are the correlation of employee skills with appropriate legislative requirements and the inability to take effective corrective action when assignments are not being properly performed.

3. Compensation
The legislative salary schedule is considerably higher than comparable classifications generally found in industry for three basic reasons:
   a. The part-time, rather than full-time, nature of the work.
   b. The travel and additional living expenses incurred by many employees.
   c. The extensive overtime which is required of many employees.
Certain inequities were reported under the present system. The appropriate per diem rate is applicable regardless of whether an employee works, or does not work, overtime. Employees who are residents of Olympia often do not work overtime because of domestic responsibilities and also do not incur the additional living expenses of an individual from outside the city. Certain problems were also reported by State Agency officials regarding the “raiding” of Merit System employees during legislative sessions.

4. Short-range recommendations
   a. After review of patronage by the respective Employment Committees, vest authority to make assignments in the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House.
   b. Certain minimum skill levels for each classification should be developed by the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House for use in determining assignments.
   c. Authority to transfer and/or dismiss employees should be granted to the Secretary of the Senate and Clerk of the House.
   d. Install a light at each legislator’s desk on the floor which would indicate that a message has been received at the telephone center.
   e. More accurately compensate for work actually performed by either paying on a per hour basis or reducing the per diem and paying a “bonus,” at the end of each session, based upon the amount of overtime.
   f. Adopt either a “variable” per diem reflecting the distance from the employee’s home to Olympia, or reduce the per diem and pay out-of-town employees a flat mileage and subsistence allowance.

5. Long-range recommendations
   a. Conduct a thorough study of legislative requirements utilizing clerical work sampling, work load forecasting, and systems analysis techniques. Such a study might review the options of (1) a central staffing agency, (2) independent committee staffing, or (3) staffing by function through legislative agencies.
   b. Recruit and train a full-time clerical staff which would be available to legislators during session and Committees out of session. Such a program should resemble the merit system approach and offer a compensation and benefit package consistent with prevailing Olympia practices.
   c. Adopt procedures which would allow the legislature to “draft” merit system employees from Olympia agencies for special projects and peak load situations during sessions.
   d. Full-time home office services for legislators cannot be justified under the present system. It would appear to be several years before the value of such services would justify the cost. A logical interim approach would be to allow legislators to utilize clerical services of local state agencies on an as-needed basis, with the time for the employees’ services being billed to the legislature.

G. CONCLUSION
The entire area of non-clerical, professional legislative staff services is not included in the purview of this report. However, because professional staff is the only acceptable alternative to professional legislators, it is strongly recommended that an in-depth study of this facet of the Washington Legislature be initiated in the near future. Washington has, for some time, had the excellent services of the staffs of its Legislative Council and Code Reviser. Such services should be retained and, if justified, expanded. But various other legislative services, such as fiscal analysis, facilities management, legislative post-audit, etc. have proven of great value to other states, and merit careful examination for possible application to the legislative process in the State of Washington.
As pointed out in the earlier part of this Report, it is a mistake not to give the legislators all the help they need in discharging their grave responsibilities in determining the policy of the state with respect to programs that affect all citizens of the state and others as well. The Committee believes that expenditures of this type should be viewed as investments in good government rather than as expenses grudgingly incurred. The Committee believes that if the recommendations that it has made in this area are adopted, the public interest will be served thereby.

The Joint Interim Committee supported the addition of the following observations and recommendations:

"The first phase in providing improved facilities for the use of the Legislature has now been completed and the expectations and direction outlined in the concurrent resolution establishing the Committee have thus been fulfilled. The Committee desires to express its deepest appreciation and give full credit to the Citizens' Advisory Committee for its assistance in formulating the plans for the remodeling and refurbishing of the Legislative Building, the Public Lands and the Public Health Buildings.

The members of the State Capitol Committee are to be commended for providing the services of the architectural firm of Walker and McGough who worked closely with the Committee, and for their approval of the remodeling plans and provision of suitable new furniture for the use of the Legislature.

The Committee recommends that an 11-member commission be authorized and established by law to carry on the work on a continuing basis for improvements of the Legislature in the future. Said commission should be composed of 3 members of the Senate, 3 members of the House of Representatives and 5 members of the public. This Commission should be charged with the responsibility of continuing the expansion of legislative facilities.

Three floors of the Health Building should be made available for the use of the House of Representatives and one floor for the use of the Legislative Council, the Legislative Budget Committee, the Interim Committee on Education, the Joint Interim Committee on Highways and the State Pension Commission. One additional floor of the Public Lands Building should be made available for the use of the Senate.

The Commission should be charged with the study of capitol parking for the Legislature and visitors and for the refurbishing of the Senate and House Chambers, and recommend such other changes and improvements that would be in the best interests of the state of Washington."

1. All Legislative Building work is permanent.
2. All furnishings are permanent.
3. Minor remodeling of Lands and Health could be considered partially temporary depending on future use. These areas could be permanent if use dictates.

EXHIBIT A
CAPITOL REMODELING

The following is a compilation of estimates for various portions of the work to be accomplished under the project “Remodel State Capitol Buildings for Legislative Facilities, State Capitol Group.” The first estimate is for the work anticipated at the preliminary phase and presented to the State Capitol Committee on July 25, 1966. The second estimate is based on completed working drawings prepared by Walker and McGough, Architects, for the construction work, and upon furnishings estimates, also prepared by Walker and McGough, Architects.

ITEM #1 PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE (7-25-66)

A. Public Health Building
   1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes, floor covering or mech. ........................................ $ 48,255.00
   2. Carpet .................................................................................. 20,000.00
   3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile.......................................................... 8,000.00
   4. Furnishings ............................................................................. 106,518.00
   5. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and carpet (excluding tile) ....................................................... $174,773.00
   6. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and V.A. Tile in lieu of carpet ..................................................... $162,773.00

B. Public Lands Building
   1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes, floor covering or mech. ........................................ $ 49,922.00
   2. Carpet .................................................................................. 20,000.00
   3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile.......................................................... 8,000.00
   4. Furnishings ............................................................................. 109,488.00
   5. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and carpet (excluding tile) ....................................................... $178,410.00
   6. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and V.A. Tile in lieu of carpet ..................................................... $167,410.00

C. Legislative Building, 3rd Floor
   1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes, floor covering or mech. ........................................ $110,000.00
   2. Carpet .................................................................................. 17,500.00
   3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile.......................................................... 7,000.00
   4. Furnishings ............................................................................. 82,604.00
   5. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and carpet (excluding tile) ....................................................... $210,104.00
   6. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and V.A. Tile in lieu of carpet ..................................................... $199,604.00

D. Legislative Building, 4th Floor
   1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes, floor covering or mech. ........................................ $129,423.00
   2. Carpet .................................................................................. 16,432.00
   3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile.......................................................... 6,572.00
   4. Furnishings ............................................................................. 89,099.00
   5. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and carpet (excluding tile) ....................................................... $235,554.00
   6. Total Preliminary Estimate incl. furnishings and V.A. Tile in lieu of carpet ..................................................... $225,694.00

E. Totals of 7-25-66 Estimate
   1. Construction Estimate of Public Health plus Public Lands using V.A. Tile not incl. furnishings (A—1+A—3+B—1+ B—3) ........................................................................................................ $114,177.00
   2. Construction Estimate, Public Health plus Public Lands using Carpet, not incl. furnishings (A—1+A—2+B—1+ B—2) ........................................................................................................ 138,177.00
   3. Furnishings for Public Health plus Public Lands (A—4+ B—4) ........................................................................ 216,006.00
   4. Construction Estimate, Legislative Building using V.A. Tile (C—1+C—3+D—1+D—3) ........................................... 252,995.00
   5. Construction Estimate, Legislative Building using Carpet (C—1+C—2+D—1+D—3) ........................................... 273,355.00
   6. Furnishings for Legislative Building (C—4+D—4) ......................................................................................... 172,303.00
   8. Total Estimate of Construction, Public Health, Public Lands and Legislative Buildings, using Carpet (E—2+ E—5) ........................................................................................................ $411,532.00
   9. Total Estimate of Furnishings, Public Health, Public Lands and Legislative Buildings (E—3+E—6) ............... $388,309.00

F. Total Preliminary Estimate Including Furnishings
   1. Total Estimate Including V.A. Tile and Furnishings (not incl. fees and taxes) (E—7+E—9) ...................................... $755,481.00
   2. Total Estimate Including Carpet and Furnishings (not incl. fees and taxes) (E—8+E—9) ........................................ 799,841.00

ITEM # 2 FINAL ESTIMATE (9-1-66)

A. Public Health Building
   1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes or floor covering ........................................................................... $ 71,431.00
   2. Carpet .................................................................................. 20,000.00
| 1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes or floor covering | $69,198.00 |
| 2. Carpet | 20,000.00 |
| 3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile | 8,000.00 |
| 4. Furnishings | 109,488.00 |
| 5. Total Estimate including furniture and carpet (excluding tile) | $198,686.00 |
| 6. Total Estimate including furniture and V.A. Tile | $196,686.00 |

| 1. Construction Estimate not including fees, taxes or floor covering | $222,396.00 |
| 2. Carpet | 35,932.00 |
| 3. Vinyl Asbestos Floor Tile | 13,572.00 |
| 4. Furnishings | 172,303.00 |
| 5. Total Estimate including furnishings and carpet (excluding tile) | $428,441.00 |
| 6. Total Estimate including furnishings and V.A. Tile | $408,681.00 |

**Totals of Final Estimate (9-2-66)**

| 1. Construction Estimate, Public Health plus Public Lands using V.A. Tile but not including furnishings (A-1+A-3+B-1+B-3) | $156,629.00 |
| 2. Construction Estimate, Public Health plus Public Lands using Carpet but not including furnishings (A-1+A-2+B-1+B-2) | 180,629.00 |
| 3. Furnishings for Public Health plus Public Lands (A-4+B-4) | 216,006.00 |
| 4. Construction Estimate for Legislative Building using V.A. Tile but not including furnishings (C-1+C-3) | 235,778.00 |
| 5. Construction Estimate for Legislative Building using carpet but not including furnishings (C-1+C-2) | 256,138.00 |
| 6. Furnishings for Legislative Building (C-4) | 172,303.00 |
| 7. Total Estimate of Construction, Public Health, Public Lands and Legislative Building using V.A. Tile (E-1+E-4) | $392,407.00 |
| 8. Total Estimate of Construction, Public Health, Public Lands and Legislative Building using Carpet (E-2+E-5) | $368,767.00 |

| 9. Total Estimate of Furnishings, Public Health, Public Lands and Legislative Building (E-2+E-6) | $388,309.00 |

**F. Fees**

Architectural Fees are based upon 8% of the total construction cost not including furnishings (8% of E-7 or E-8) which amounts to approximately $31,392.00 or $34,941.00.

In addition the Architects have agreed to select and specify furnishings for the project. Fees for this work will be calculated by a multiple of time spent on the work, plus reimbursable expenses. This amount will probably be under $5,000.00, unless unforeseen complications demanding extra work arise.
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Secretary
Secretary to the Secretary
Assistant Secretary
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Dishwasher
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ESTIMATED COST OF DATA PROCESSING

Recommendations For the Next Biennium
For Washington State Legislature

Bearing in mind, the recommendations here and after made with respect to data processing, the following is an estimate of cost for the next biennium:

In a biennium, the costs of operations are likely to be related to three periods of time. For the forthcoming two years beginning July 1, 1967, these are as follows:

Period One—July 1, 1967—November 30, 1968
Period Two—December 1, 1968—March 31, 1969
Period Three—April 1, 1969—June 30, 1969

Period One would be developmental in nature and would require the services of a systems specialist and a computer programmer. The costs of development would run in the vicinity of $115,000, compiled as follows:

- Systems Man ................... $ 17,000 (1,000/month)
- Programmer ................... 12,000 ($700/month)
- Supplies ................... 3,000
- Testing ................... 2,000
- Miscellaneous ................... 6,000

40,000

Set up of file................... 75,000 (U of Pittsburgh estimate)

$115,000

Period Two is basically operational in nature and includes the actual legislative session. The costs of this four month period include the salaries of the systems specialist, programmer, supplies and include the dedication on a full time basis of a computer either leased from a manufacturer or a State agency.

- Systems Man ................... $ 4,000
- Programmer ................... 2,800
- Supplies ................... 2,000
- Computer ................... 42,000 (1400 hrs. @ $30/hr.)
- Miscellaneous ................... 1,200

$ 52,000

Period Three would cost $12,000 as follows:

- Personnel ................... $ 5,100
- Computer ................... 6,000 ($2000 per month)
- Miscellaneous ................. 900

$ 12,000

Thus, the costs for two years would approximate $179,000 including $75,000 one time costs for creating the statute files. These estimates include Bill Drafting, Legislative Record and Topical Index and Statute Retrieval and exclude printing of statutes.

Although in subsequent two year periods the $75,000 charge will be
eliminated it is fair to expect that computer use and cost will increase as no actual usage was included during period one in the next biennium. A normal two year period would cost approximately $128,000. This is calculated as:

Personnel—($1,700/mo.) ...................... $ 40,800
Supplies .......................................... 5,000
Computer Use—($2,000/mo. × 20 mos.) ... 40,000
Computer—(1400 hrs. @ $30/hr.) ........... 42,000 (Session)

$127,800

These figures are estimates and are subject to adjustment. They do, however, portray an order of magnitude to be expected if computer equipment is utilized. The extent of utilization will influence the cost greatly. For example, if statute retrieval is sold as an important aid to lawyers and legislators, it will cost more while it performs greater service. Thus the costs are largely estimates now and will remain so for some time to come.

EXHIBIT C

V
CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The Joint Interim Legislative Committee on Facilities and Operations adopted the following report as amended on pages 87 and 88.

A. INTRODUCTION

The product of a democratic government is shaped by the will of the peoples; hence, the people have the right to expect the best representation from their elected officers who are, in effect, charged with that responsibility.

Ideally, if a legislator is able to determine the will of the majority, he should act accordingly. But a wise man once said: “An ideal is a plane to which God descends, and to which man can only attempt to ascend.” Legislators are men. Occasionally a legislator is faced with a conflict between his interests as a private citizen and those of the citizenry, and could be torn by indecision. At such a time, most would welcome guides or counsel.

Ethical standards vary from man to man. To avoid ambiguity in this area and thus eliminate confusion and misunderstanding, it would seem fitting that a code of ethics be formulated which, if incorporated into legislation, would serve as a guideline for men committed to acting in the best interests of the public.

Having determined that Washington Substitute Senate Bill 1 was well intended and basically sound, our committee concentrated its efforts on correcting the bill’s inadequacies. The committee believed that its recommendations for a code of ethical standards, acceptable to the public and not unduly restrictive of the legislators, would serve this purpose.

To come to some agreement on determinations, the sub-committee on Conflicts of Interest held five meetings prior to a public hearing on April 22, at the University of Washington. This hearing was the highlight and culmination of the sub-committee's research inasmuch as it focused attention on such questions as what conflict of interest legislation should include and how