

SUBCOMMITTEE ON RELOCATION OF
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OFFICES AND LABORATORIES
OF THE
AGRICULTURE STANDING COMMITTEE
INTERIM REPORT

On July 22, I was notified that the Iowa Legislative Council had approved a study of the possible relocation of the Department of Agriculture Offices and Laboratories into a single building as proposed in House File 530.

The Iowa Legislative Council authorized one joint Senate-House subcommittee of five members, to meet twice, to make this study.

This study committee is composed of Senators Clarke and Keith and Representatives Kruse, Pierson and myself. It should be noted that Senator Clarke and Representative Kruse are members of the State Government Committees in their respective Houses. Senator Clarke is also a member of the Capitol Planning Commission.

It was thought advisable to have the chairmen of the subcommittees on Agricultural appropriations present at the meetings of the study committee on the relocation of the Department Offices and Laboratories. These people are Senator Curran and Representative Shaw.

Copies of the Capitol Planning Commission's progress report to the Sixty-third General Assembly were distributed at the first meeting of the study committee.

This report on estimated space requirements, calls for the Department of Agriculture to vacate its division offices in the Capitol Building for the use of elective officials and the General Assembly. The report also calls for the Agriculture laboratories to vacate their present location at East Seventh and Court, for Archives' use.

The Capitol Planning Commission further proposes a new Agriculture Office and Laboratory building, to be located on the Capitol grounds in the area south of Court Street and east of Twelfth Street.

The building was planned for 100,000 square feet of floor space. Since then new duties have been added to the Department of Agriculture such as meat inspection, moisture meter inspection and consumer protection services. The Federal Government also requires certain laboratory standards to qualify for some Federal Aids and equipment. Some of the affiliated promotion groups have indicated a desire to be a part of the Depart-

ment of Agriculture, as did the Sheep Association in the last session.

In view of the projections for the next fifteen years it was suggested that the space requirements be updated.

I received an invitation from the Capitol Planning Commission to attend their December 3 meeting. At that meeting, the Commission gave unanimous approval for a somewhat larger building than proposed.

Mr. Bunker, an architect and a member of the Capitol Planning Commission, agreed to attend our next study committee meeting and answer questions in regard to the proposed building.

L. B. Liddy, Secretary of the Iowa Department of Agriculture, Robert Lounsberry, Deputy Secretary, Donald Booten, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, Kenneth Fulk, Secretary of the Iowa State Fair Board, Gail Danielson, of the Iowa Beef Producers Association, Mike Ford of the Iowa Swine Producers Association, Corywn Hicks of the Iowa Horticulture Society, Sidney Gross of the Iowa Farmers Union, and Sandra Githens, Research Analyst of the Legislative Service Bureau, were present at the first meeting of the study committee. After hearing these people and after some discussion the following motion was made and approved by the study committee:

"That due to the present lack of space, the present laboratory decentralization, administration problems resulting from the different locations of the various agencies within the Department, the increased consumer demands for protection and quality controls, the priority that Agriculture plays in Iowa's economy, and to increase the efficiency and economy of the Iowa Department of Agriculture, that this study committee recommends to the Legislature that there is need for an Agriculture Office and Laboratory Building on the Capitol grounds."

Secretary Liddy was asked to estimate the space requirements for the next fifteen years as requested by the Capitol Planning Commission.

Mr. Bunker was present at the second meeting of the study committee and outlined some of the proposed features of the building. Namely that the building would be of stone construction and not more than three stories in height, to complement and relate to the Capitol building. Also that the building would be constructed so that additions could be made without detracting from its appearance. That there was ample room in the location to do this and to provide parking space. He also

stated that the natural slope would permit a drive-in basement for heavy equipment, such as weight trucks.

I wrote to sixteen of the leading Agricultural states asking them if they had Agricultural buildings, how they were financed, their number of employees, and their space requirements. Most of them had the problem of scattered facilities. Some of them had done something about it. Illinois has approved a \$10,000,000 building, financed by a premium fund which comes from pari-mutuel betting. California has the former Highway Commission building, which is quite a building even to an auditorium. Georgia has the most pretentious building of all, financed by a legislative appropriation. Wisconsin has a similar situation.

Most states agreed that the footage for our proposed building was conservative for the number of employees and the services required.

Presently there are uncommitted funds of \$1,337,143.90 in the Department of Agriculture trust funds. The authority to create this fund, and its use, is set out in section 159.23 of the Code.

To date the interest from this fund has gone into the General Fund.

There have been reversions from the Department of Agriculture to the General Fund of several million dollars in past years. The latest reversion was \$900,000 in October. So the Iowa Department of Agriculture is not a prodigal son or poor relation.

There is some valid argument that inspection fees should be used only for laboratory equipment. However legislative appropriations and/or revenue bonds financed by fees or services are possible means of financing an Agricultural building.

Senate File 537, passed in the last session, gave the Board of Regents authority to establish fees and charges, to issue revenue bonds payable solely from such fees and charges, and to refund bonds from these fees and charges, to construct and equip academic and administrative buildings. It is also the intent that revenue bonds supplement and not supplant appropriations. So there is a precedent established.

A motion was made that the Director of the Legislative Service Bureau, Serge H. Garrison, present at the meeting, draw a rough draft of a bill following some of the procedures outlined in House File 530 and the desires of the study committee pertaining to an Agriculture building. Motion carried unanimously.

The committee agreed to review the bill when the Legislature reconvenes.

Respectfully submitted,

REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES F. STROTHMAN
Subcommittee Chairman