

M I N U T E S

PROCEDURES AND FACILITIES COMMITTEE OF THE IOWA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

October 5, 1971

The third meeting of the Procedures and Facilities Committee of the Iowa Legislative Council was called to order by the Committee Chairman, Speaker of the House William H. Harbor, at 1:40 p.m., Tuesday, October 4, 1971, in the Speaker's Room, State House, Des Moines. Members present in addition to Chairman Harbor were:

Senator James E. Briles
Senator Eugene M. Hill
Representative Dale M. Cochran
Representative Nathan F. Sorg
Representative Andrew P. Varley

Also present were Senator Francis Messerly and Representative Richard Radl of the Budget and Financial Control Committee, the members of the Capitol Planning Commission, and architect Frank Bunker, Chief Clerk of the House William R. Kendrick, Secretary of the Senate Carroll A. Lane, Legislative Fiscal Director Gerry D. Rankin, Director Serge Garrison and Phil Burks of the Legislative Service Bureau, and a number of representatives of the news media and other interested persons.

Capitol Planning Commission Chairman Amos Emery reported that the Commission was prepared to present plans for the remodeling of the area in the east wing of the State House presently occupied by the Legislative Fiscal Director's office. Mr. Emery then introduced Mr. Bunker, who described the plans, several copies of which were made available to the members of the Procedures and Facilities Committee for transmission to the Legislative Council. Essentially, the plans proposed double-decking the area immediately east of the grand staircase mural, the rooms immediately adjoining this area on the north and south sides of the east wing at the second floor level, presently occupied respectively by the ladies rest room and the former press room which is now a part of the Fiscal Director's office. Mr. Bunker pointed out that the proposed double-decking could, with very little difficulty, be extended to the areas presently occupied by the respective Senate and House cloak rooms. His plans, and the proposed extension, contemplate continued use of the basic second floor areas of the Senate and House cloak rooms and the ladies rest room for their present purposes, and the continued existence of a ladies lounge at its present location immediately north of the Fiscal Director's office area, although the lounge would be slightly reduced in area in order to permit a hallway to pass in front of it.

In response to questions from Senator Hill, Mr. Bunker explained that air conditioning of the area proposed for remodeling would be handled by a system which would make use of the existing air ducts in the original State House structure, and that most of the mechanical components of the air conditioning system would be located in the attic. In further response to Senator Hill, Senator Wilson Davis, a member of the Capitol Planning Commission, enlarged upon technical aspects of the proposed air conditioning system, stating that approximately forty percent of the installation would be salvageable in the event that an overall air conditioning system is developed for the entire State House at some later time. Senator Davis commented that the installation proposed by Mr. Bunker would also eliminate two existing window air conditioning units, and thereby restore in that respect the original appearance of the State House exterior as viewed from the east side.

In response to questions from Chairman Harbor, Mr. Bunker offered a rough estimate of approximately \$50,000 as the cost of the remodeling contemplated by the plans he had presented and described, although he stated that there were a number of variables involved and that it would not be possible to make a detailed estimate of the cost until a decision has been made on each of these variables. Mr. Bunker stated that he has not discussed the matter with any contractor, and does not know whether a contractor is readily available who could begin work on the project in the immediate future, but assuming a contractor is available, it should be possible to complete or substantially complete all of the proposed remodeling by January, 1972, except for the air conditioning installation. Mr. Bunker indicated that completion of this installation would have to await completion of the rewiring of the State House which is presently underway, in order to make sufficient electrical power available.

Representative Cochran inquired why the Capitol Planning Commission had not considered double-decking House Committee Room 1 and Senate Committee Room 22, which had earlier been discussed by the Legislative Council. Mr. Emery replied to the effect that the Commission did not feel it had sufficient time to give full consideration to that proposal as well as to the proposal for remodeling the area presently occupied by the Fiscal Director. Senator Davis commented that committee rooms 1 and 22 have a certain charm in their present decor, and that he and other members of the Commission would like to look more fully into the possibility of vacating other office space in the State House and turning it over to the legislature rather than double-decking either of these rooms.

After further discussion, Chairman Harbor asked for comments from the Budget and Financial Control Committee, which was represented at the meeting by its Vice Chairman, Senator Messerly,

and by Representative Radl. Senator Messerly expressed the opinion that the preservation of the aesthetic value of the State House should be a primary consideration. Senator Messerly stated that he was present at this meeting because Budget and Financial Control Committee Chairman Representative Elmer Den Herder is traveling outside the state at present, and explained that he has not had an opportunity to consult with other members of the Budget and Financial Control Committee about this specific matter, but he expressed the view that the original State House walls, wainscoting and woodwork should not be covered with relatively inexpensive sheetrock and plywood panel. He stated that if additional state offices are needed, it would be preferable to appropriate the necessary funds to construct new buildings. Senator Messerly then posed two questions: First, do the plans presented at this meeting have the approval of the Capitol Planning Commission, and second, is this proposal part of the long-range plan that has been developed over the past several years or is it a piece-meal response to an immediate need for more legislative office space.

In response to Senator Messerly's questions, Mr. Emery stated that the Capitol Planning Commission did partially approve the proposal presented to it by the Legislative Council, although the Commission did not approve the proposed double-decking of Committee Rooms 1 and 2. He explained that, with reference to the plans which had been presented to the Procedures and Facilities Committee at the present meeting, it was the Commission's view that the proposed remodeling would not scar the State House and would help to meet an urgent need which presently exists. Mr. Emery further stated that the plans submitted are essentially a short-term response to a specific situation, and not contemplated by any long-range plan which the Commission has thus far developed.

Senator Messerly then commented that in his view it is time to stop changing the Capitol Building, and to preserve the remaining portions of its original structure and decor for future generations. Representative Don Alt, a member of the Capitol Planning Commission commented that it is almost certain that additional office and other space immediately adjacent to the legislative chambers will be urgently needed, whatever may be done elsewhere in terms of providing additional state office space. Senator Davis agreed, adding that the proposed remodeling represented by the plans just submitted is what he termed "a completely reversible process." That is, should another building later be constructed which would house the offices and personnel who would be served by the proposed remodeling, the remodeling could, in effect, be undone in such a way as to leave the affected portion of the State House in its original condition. Representative Radl commented that the only physical damage to the existing State House structure would be two new door openings in original walls, with two additional openings if it is decided to

extend the double-decking to the present Senate and House cloak room areas. Mr. Bunker confirmed that the plans he had presented would not involve destruction of the wainscoting about which Senator Messerly had expressed concern, explaining that the wainscoting would be covered but would still be in its original position and could be uncovered if the remodeling were "undone" at some future time as Senator Davis had suggested.

Senator Messerly stated that he does not agree that the proposed remodeling is a reversible process, and that he is convinced that if the proposed double-decking is carried out the new floors, partitions, and stairways will never be removed. He reiterated his view that the proper way to meet the need for additional legislative office space is to move some of the agencies presently located in the Capitol Building out, and if necessary to construct another new state office building. Representative Luvern Kehe, a member of the Capitol Planning Commission, stated that the proposed remodeling is a short-term response to an immediate need for additional legislative office space, and that the Capitol Planning Commission would not be willing to go any further in terms of remodeling the interior of the State House in any significant manner. Representative Varley expressed agreement with Representative Alt's earlier comment regarding the importance of office space immediately adjacent to the legislative chambers, and added that while the preservation of the aesthetic value of the State House should be a primary objective it must also be remembered that the Capitol is not just a monument but a functioning office building. He added that so far as he is aware, there is not much public traffic in the area presently occupied by the Legislative Fiscal Director and his staff.

In response to a question from Chairman Varley, Mr. Rankin said he has no objection to the proposed remodeling of his office area. However, he urged that if the project is approved, it be handled expeditiously so as to minimize the time he and his staff will be unable to use their offices.

In concluding presentation of the proposed plans for remodeling of the Fiscal Director's office area, Mr. Emery commented that there are two views of overall utilization of the State House; the long-range view and the short-term view, and both have their points. He pointed out that lack of funds has prevented continued development and implementation of the Capitol Planning Commission's long-range plan for the Capitol complex. However, there is a danger of damage to the aesthetic value of the State House from shortrun solutions to the immediate problems. He suggested that some consideration be given to the possibility of constructing an entirely new legislative building away from the present State House.

Representative Alt and Mr. John Crose, of the firm of Crose and Associates, briefly presented, and responded to questions concerning, proposals for revised parking arrangements around the Capitol complex. The proposals involve the installation of limited access parking controlled by mechanical gates, with spaces to be assigned to legislators, legislative staff, and other state employees, on the existing parking lots immediately east of the Capitol building, across East 12th street west of the Lucas Building, and across Walnut Avenue south of the Lucas Building. The present parking lot immediately north of the Lucas Building would be held primarily for visitor parking, and a new landscaped, permanently surfaced 106 car parking lot would be constructed north of Grand Avenue and immediately east of East 12th Avenue. In answer to questions, Representative Alt and Mr. Crose stated that the net effect of the proposed changes would be addition of approximately 100 more parking spaces than presently exist at a cost of some \$80,000, including surfacing of the proposed new parking lot. They stated the proposed new parking lot is consistent with the long-range plan for development of the Capitol complex.

In answer to a question from Representative Varley as to how soon the General Assembly might expect to receive a report on long-range plans for meeting state office space needs, Representative Alt stated that the Capitol Planning Commission hopes to initiate a space needs study at once, and submit a report to the 1972 legislative session.

Capitol Planning Commission member William Wagner expressed essential agreement with the views earlier stated by Senator Messerly regarding the desirability of preserving all of the remaining original structure and decor of the State House. He added that, in fairness to the other Commission members, he should state that he had missed two meetings of the Commission at which the plans presented at the present meeting were discussed, and that therefore he had not been in a position to make other Commission members aware of his views on the matter at an earlier time.

Mr. Emery expressed appreciation for the opportunity for the Capitol Planning Commission to meet with the Procedures and Facilities Committee. He commented that the proposed new parking arrangements are good, but are essentially a stop-gap measure. He expressed preference for eventual construction of underground parking facilities which would permit returning some of the present surfaced parking areas to green space, at such time as funds become available.

The members of the Capitol Planning Commission, Senator Messerly, Representative Radl, and Mr. Rankin then left the meeting.

Representative Cochran stated he approves of the proposal submitted to the Procedures and Facilities Committee by the Capitol Planning Commission. Senator Briles agreed, but expressed concern about the possibility of having the project completed by the time the 1972 session convenes. Representative Sorg said he does not think it is crucial if the project is not entirely completed at that time, since the legislative chambers themselves will not be involved. Senator Hill also spoke in favor of proceeding with the proposed plan.

Mr. Kendrick pointed out that the Capitol Planning Commission had specifically recommended against doing anything to House Committee Room 1 and Senate Committee Room 22, which he and Mr. Lane had earlier suggested double-decking. Mr. Lane observed that, aside from the question of the Capitol Planning Commission's opposition, there is not enough time remaining before the convening of the 1972 session to undertake any significant remodeling in rooms 1 and 22 in any case.

Senator Hill expressed some concern that none of the proposals which had thus far been considered by the Procedures and Facilities Committee would meet the need for women's rest room facilities in or immediately adjacent to the legislative chambers. Mr. Lane commented that, at least on the Senate side, he believes that it should be possible to partition the existing men's rest room and convert a portion of it to a women's rest room without great difficulty.

Representative Sorg moved that the Procedures and Facilities Committee recommend to the Legislative Council that it proceed with remodeling of the east wing second floor area presently occupied by the Legislative Fiscal Director and his staff in accordance with plans presented by the Capitol Planning Commission, expanding those plans to include double-decking of the present Senate and House cloakrooms as suggested by Mr. Bunker earlier in the present meeting. The motion was seconded by Representative Cochran. In the ensuing discussion, Mr. Lane suggested specifying that the remodeling be undertaken on the basis of a negotiated contract, rather than by receiving sealed bids, in order to save time. Representative Sorg said that he would have no objection to forwarding Mr. Lane's suggestion to the Legislative Council but would prefer not to include it in his motion. Representative's Sorg original motion was then passed by a unanimous voice vote.

There was some discussion of the proposal for revised parking arrangements which had been described to the Procedures and Facilities Committee by the Capitol Planning Commission. A portion of the discussion related to the question whether this particular matter is within the Legislative Council's jurisdiction.

Senator Briles moved that the Procedures and Facilities Committee defer until a later date any action relative to proposed changes in existing Capitol complex parking arrangements. The motion was seconded by Representative Varley. Representative Sorg commented that, on the basis of his own experience in acquiring and developing additional parking space for his private business, he believes that the estimated \$80,000 price tag for a net gain of 100 new parking spaces is a bargain.

Treasurer of State Maurice Baringer arrived at the meeting at 2:45 p.m. In answer to a question from Chairman Harbor, Mr. Baringer stated that the Executive Council has no present plans for any changes in regard to Capitol complex parking arrangements.

Representative Cochran then moved, as a substitute for Senator Briles' motion, that the Procedures and Facilities Committee take no action on the proposed changes in parking arrangements presented by the Capitol Planning Commission, as this matter is not within the jurisdiction of the Legislative Council at least insofar as parking for non-legislative employees is concerned. The substitute motion was seconded by Senator Hill. After considerable discussion, the substitute motion was defeated by a vote of 2 to 4, Chairman Harbor, Senator Briles, and Representatives Sorg and Varley voting no.

Senator Briles' original motion was then adopted on a voice vote, Representative Sorg voting no.

Representative Varley said he had been informed that the state Junior Chamber of Commerce would like to hold its state meeting on governmental affairs later this fall in the House Chamber. There was a brief discussion, Representative Cochran and Mr. Kendrick expressing the view that such a meeting is in the same general category as the YMCA Model Legislature and Boys State, and does not contravene the intent of the policy adopted with the primary intent of stopping the use of the legislative chambers for state agency meetings and examinations. Committee members generally expressed agreement that the proposed Junior Chamber of Commerce State Government meeting is a worthwhile purpose, and that Mr. Kendrick has authority to permit use of the House Chamber for this meeting.

Treasurer Baringer stated that he was present because the Executive Council feels that it is at least desirable, if not required by chapter 2 of the 1971 Code, that the Executive Council consult with the Legislative Council regarding space allocation in the State House, particularly that which affects space presently utilized by the General Assembly. He pointed out that the Director of the new General Services agency needs space for an office during the transitional period prior to January 1, 1973, when the new

agency is to be fully operational, and that it will be most advantageous if the Director's office has close accessibility to the offices of the Governor and the Comptroller. Therefore, the Executive Council would like authority to partition that part of the Legislative Dining Room where the serving line is located, in order to make an office for the General Services Director in the south portion of this area, which is presently occupied by six tables having a total seating capacity of twenty-four persons. Treasurer Baringer commented that the space involved does not seem to be heavily utilized, even during legislative sessions, and is rarely utilized at all between sessions. He added that while the allocation of the proposed new office to the General Services Director would not be permanent, the use of the space involved for an office might well become so because of the urgent need for other office space in the State House.

In response to questions from Representative Cochran and Senator Hill, Treasurer Baringer stated that the proposed partitioning of the south area of the serving room would leave a fourteen foot wide area to be occupied by the serving line itself. He stated that the Executive Council is presently engaged in attempts to obtain a rental facility for the Office for Planning and Programming, which is now located in five separate places in the state office complex. Treasurer Baringer said that OPP now occupies very little space in the State House itself.

Representative Varley indicated that the proposal advanced by Treasurer Baringer is acceptable to him, but that he would like to have the Code Editor's indexer moved out of the room, in the southeastern corner of the Legislative Dining Room area, which formerly served as a lounge available to legislators during the session. Representative Cochran echoed Representative Varley's concern about this area, stressing the importance of having a facility where legislators could hold semi-private meetings with constituents or other groups interested in pending legislation. Treasurer Baringer observed that the assignment of this area to the Code Editor's indexer was partly in response to a need for this particular individual to have an office with good natural lighting, but he added that the assignment was made only after observation of the utilization of this area indicated that it was not being used to any appreciable degree by legislators. Representatives Varley and Cochran expressed disagreement with Treasurer Baringer regarding the extent to which the lounge area was utilized by legislators during the 1971 session, and Treasurer Baringer agreed that the observations referred to were made during the early part of the session, when many legislators might not have been fully aware of the availability of this facility.

After further discussion, it was agreed to refer the proposal presented by Treasurer Baringer to the Legislative Council

on the following day, and that Treasurer Baringer would be present to participate in the discussion. It was also agreed that Treasurer Baringer would check with the Code Editor to determine the possibility of returning use of the lounge in the southeast corner of the Legislative Dining Room to the General Assembly.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

SERGE H. GARRISON
Director

PHILIP E. BURKS
Senior Research Analyst