

M I N U T E S

ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE  
OF THE  
IOWA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

October 9, 1973

The second meeting of the Administration Committee of the Iowa Legislative Council was called to order at 1:10 p.m. Tuesday, October 9, 1973 in the Speaker's Room of the State House with the following members present:

Speaker Andrew Varley, Chairman  
Senator Roger J. Shaff  
Senator Karl Nolin  
Representative Edgar H. Holden

Also present were Secretary of the Senate Ralph Brown and Senate Payroll Clerk Mary Ann Abbott, House Payroll Clerk Billie Jean Walling, Director Serge Garrison, Senior Research Analyst Phil Burks, Financial Secretary Marguerite Ash and Assistant Executive Secretary Marge Gerst of the Legislative Service Bureau.

Chairman Varley recognized Mr. Garrison, who stated that he, Mr. Brown, Chief Clerk of the House William Harbor and Legislative Fiscal Director Gerry Rankin all agree that the method of submitting the vouchers for interim expenses and per diem of legislators, and also the method of funding such activities, could be improved. The Legislative Service Bureau administers the financing of study committees, the Legislative Council and the Commission on Interstate Cooperation, the Legislative Fiscal Director's office administers the funding of the Legislative Fiscal Committee and the visitation committees, the Chief Clerk of the House administers the funding of House members on standing committee subcommittees, and the Secretary of the Senate administers the funding of Senate members on standing committee subcommittees. In addition, each of these agencies have legislators who are paid for special participation in national activities.

Mr. Garrison continued that it appears that there are too many funds, and too many legislators filing on different funds. As a result, it becomes extremely difficult for the financial staff when a legislator attends successive meetings for which he is entitled to receive expense and per diem money from different funds. Thus he may be entitled to one-way mileage from one fund and the same from another, his hotel claim can be filed on either fund, his per diem may be from two or more different funds, etc. Cross-checking by the various staffs is time consuming and confusing. It occasionally becomes necessary to wait until a particular legislator files one voucher before it is possible to process an earlier voucher, in order to determine what he is claiming from which fund.

Mr. Brown commented that in addition to the various legislative agencies Mr. Garrison had mentioned, there are a number of executive branch agencies which pay legislators for service on

various commissions and similar agencies on which they serve by appointment of the presiding officers of the respective houses. In total, there are thirteen funds outside those of the General Assembly itself from which money is disbursed to legislators for such services.

Representative Holden pointed out that legislators receive only one periodic check for all of the per diem payment to which they are entitled for that period. Mr. Brown and Mrs. Walling agreed that this is correct but pointed out that in order to do so, it is necessary to use a system of charge-backs and transfers from one agency appropriation to another, which has the effect of making it appear from the State Comptroller's records that expenditures for per diem pay to legislators are substantially higher than is actually the case.

It was the consensus of the Committee, after some discussion, that it is not feasible to make any change in the accounting and disbursement system for per diem and expenses of legislators during the present interim, although it might be feasible to make such a change as early as the 1974 interim if the Council should so desire. Mr. Garrison commented that it has been his thought that the creation of a single fund for expenses and per diem of all legislators should take place as of July 1, 1975, and that if such a step is taken before then presumably the funds appropriated to the Service Bureau, and to other agencies, for per diem and salary of legislators should be transferred to the new fund.

At the suggestion of Representative Holden, it was agreed that additional pertinent information will be prepared for submission to the Administration Committee at its next meeting, and that State Comptroller Marvin Selden or a representative of his office should be asked to meet with the Committee at that time. Chairman Varley expressed appreciation to the various legislative agency staff personnel with payroll responsibilities for attending and participating in the meeting.

Mr. Brown presented to the Committee information regarding the possible installation of an electronic voting system in the Senate, which he had gathered and prepared pursuant to the request of the Committee at its previous meeting. Copies of the memorandum prepared by Mr. Brown and of the first seven attachments listed on the second page of the memorandum are attached to and by this reference made a part of these minutes. The Committee discussed the information presented by Mr. Brown for several minutes.

At 2:00 p.m. Architect Frank Bunker appeared to inform the Committee that six firms had submitted sealed bids on the Legislative Service Bureau mezzanine construction and remodeling, and the associated work covered by the alternatives #1 and #2 previously approved by the Legislative Council, and that representatives of the firms which had submitted the bids were assembled in House Committee Room 1 to await the opening of the bids. The Committee then recessed and reconvened in Room 1, at which time

Chairman Varley requested Mr. Garrison to proceed with the opening of the bids. A resume of the six bids received is attached to and by this reference made a part of these minutes.

Mr. Bunker noted that the King-Bole bid appeared to be the lowest. He expressed appreciation to each of the bidders for their interest in the project.

The Committee recessed and again reconvened in the Speaker's Room, with Mr. Bunker also present. Mr. Bunker briefly discussed the bids received, and indicated that all six firms which had submitted bids are established and reputable contractors.

Mr. Bunker noted that although the work which is to be done in addition to the Legislative Service Bureau office area remodeling, for which funds have been specifically appropriated by the General Assembly, are expressed as alternatives in the plans and specifications pursuant to which bids were received, the work covered by the base bid is not actually separable from the work covered by alternative #1. Senator Shaff expressed the view that in any case both alternatives #1 and #2 should be approved, since air conditioning of meeting rooms in the four tower quadrants in the State House, which are used by interim legislative committees during the summer time, is perhaps more important than the air conditioning of the legislative chambers themselves.

Senator Shaff moved that the Committee recommend to the Legislative Council acceptance of the King-Bole bid for the basic project and alternatives #1 and #2. The motion was adopted by a unanimous voice vote.

Mr. Bunker noted that he had received a proposal from the AudioCom firm of Des Moines, dated September 25, proposing to replace the two existing fifty watt amplifiers in the Senate public address system with two one hundred watt amplifiers for the sum of \$645, and to replace the two existing fifty watt amplifiers in the House public address system with one hundred watt amplifiers for the sum of \$585. Mr. Bunker noted that this work is not a part of the contract which the Committee had just recommended that the Council award, but that the larger amplifiers will probably be necessary in order to adequately serve the additional remote speakers which will be installed in the new offices to be constructed in the Legislative Service Bureau area. Committee members raised the question whether the proposed replacement of the existing amplifiers with larger capacity equipment will overcome difficulties which were experienced from time to time in the House during the 1973 session. Mr. Burks was instructed to contact AudioCom and inquire about this point. (NOTE: AudioCom subsequently informed Mr. Burks that replacement of the existing amplifiers in the House with larger capacity equipment will improve the performance of the House public address system but cannot be considered a "cure all".)

The Committee resumed consideration of the possible installation of an electronic voting system in the Senate. Mr.

Brown inquired who it is anticipated will make the final decision as to whether a machine should be purchased and installed, the Legislative Council or the Senate itself. Chairman Varley stated it has been his understanding that Legislative Council Chairman Lamborn wants the Council to make the decision on whether or not a Senate voting machine will be acquired.

After further discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Brown will seek from the two companies presently manufacturing and installing legislative voting machines information on the cost of installing a machine in the Senate. This information will be sought by outlining to each of the companies the basic requirements and ideas for possible additional features for a machine and permitting each company to submit a proposal in response to this requirement and alternative, rather than establishing precise specifications and asking companies to bid. Since there are only two companies in the nation, it was felt that establishment of precise specifications would tend to rule out one of the two firms and create a monopoly situation for the other.

There was a brief discussion of whether, in contacting the two firms, Mr. Brown should also inquire about the cost of possible installation of a new voting machine in the House of Representatives. It was the consensus of the Committee that there would be no likelihood of any saving by installing machines simultaneously in both houses, rather than obtaining a machine for the Senate in the near future and one to replace the present House equipment at a later date, except possibly by reason of the same personnel handling both installations while they are in Des Moines.

Citizens' Aide Tom Mayer arrived at the meeting at 3:00 p.m. for a discussion of the 1973-74 estimated budget for the Office of Citizens' Aide. Mr. Garrison explained that the Legislative Service Bureau staff has recently begun assisting Mr. Mayer by performing accounting functions for the Office of Citizens' Aide. It appeared that this was necessary on a short-term basis since there is presently no one on Mr. Mayer's staff with sufficient experience to perform this function. However, it is hoped that the Office of the Citizens' Aide can resume performing this function internally in the not too distant future.

Mr. Garrison and Mrs. Ash distributed to Committee members copies of the Office of the Citizens' Aide 1973-74 estimated budget, estimated salary account, and salary scale, copies of which are attached to and by this reference made a part of these minutes. It was explained that these documents had been developed for Mr. Mayer's use by the Legislative Service Bureau Office in consultation with Mr. Mayer.

Mr. Mayer distributed copies of a document entitled "Proposal to Administration Committee of Legislative Council", which is also attached to and by this reference made a part of these minutes. These proposals included a table of organization listing salaries of each staff member of the Office of the Citizens' Aide. Mr. Garrison noted that the salaries of \$13,500

listed for the Deputy Citizens' Aide, and \$11,500 listed for the Second Deputy Citizens' Aide, are, respective, \$1,500 and \$500 higher than had been used in computing the estimated budget and estimated salary account prepared in the Legislative Service Bureau office. Mr. Mayer explained that he feels that the staff members in question are entitled to the increased salaries, commenting that the Deputy Citizens' Aide has certain responsibilities in relation to the operation of the office at times when it is necessary for Mr. Mayer to be out of the office.

After some discussion, Chairman Varley expressed concern that the appropriation available to the Office of the Citizens' Aide will not be sufficient to fund the operation of the Office through the end of the 1973-75 biennium if the increased salaries suggested by Mr. Mayer are put into effect at the present time. He suggested that Mr. Mayer prepare budget proposals which would assure that the Office of the Citizens' Aide could operate through the end of the biennium on its present appropriation, and then request a supplemental appropriation from the 1974 session if it is felt that salary increases are necessary. Chairman Varley further requested that Mr. Mayer consult with Mr. Garrison and Mrs. Ash prior to submission of the budget for the Office of the Citizens' Aide to the Legislative Council on the following day.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

SERGE H. GARRISON  
Director

PHILIP E. BURKS  
Senior Research Analyst