

TO: MEMBERS OF THE IOWA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

FROM: GARY L. KAUFMAN *GLK*
Legal Counsel

RE: SCHOOL DIRECTOR DISTRICT REDISTRICTING

June 12, 1984

In 1983 the 70th General Assembly passed Senate File 485, which required school districts which elect directors from director districts or subdistricts to redistrict themselves by May 30, 1984. The main substantive provisions of the bill can be found in section 275.23A, Code Supplement 1983, a copy of which is attached. There are three standards which have been placed on the school districts by the legislature:

1. The director districts are to be nearly equal as practicable to the ideal population for the districts.
2. The director districts are to be composed of contiguous territory.
3. The director districts are to be as compact as practicable.

In addition the legislation requires that the director districts' population statistics be based on the most recent federal decennial census. If a school district's board fails to make the required changes in redrawing their director districts, the state commissioner of elections is required to make or cause to be made the necessary changes and shall assess any expenses incurred to the school district. If more than one incumbent director reside in the same redrawn director district, and their terms extend beyond the board meeting following the next regular school election, their terms of office are shortened and they must seek reelection to remain on the board.

Under the legislation, the state commissioner of elections may and has asked the Legislative Service Bureau for assistance in making required boundary changes. Louise Whitcome of the Secretary of State's office has initially reviewed all of the

school district's plans and in cases where she has found that the plan seems questionable she has sent the plans to me to review. A listing of these school districts is attached to this report.

The most important parameter in redistricting is the population equality. The "nearly equal as practicable" standard selected by the legislature has been interpreted in a long line of court decisions. In reviewing these decisions, I have come to the same conclusions as my predecessor, the late Phil Burks, in that the cases seem to require that a plan be subjected to stricter scrutiny if the largest district exceeds the smallest district by more than 10 percent:

"If a state enacts or adopts a plan with an overall population range of more than 10 percent . . . it appears likely that the state will have the burden of showing both that the over 10 percent range is necessary to implement a rational state policy and that it does not dilute or take away the voting strength of any particular group of citizens." Philip E. Burks, David A. Epstein, and Samuel A. Alito, Federal Case Law: State Legislative and Congressional Districting, in Reapportionment: Law and Technology 16 (1980).

The courts differentiate the term "practicable" from "practical" in that redistricting requires population equality as equal as practicable, not what is politically practical. About the only justification for population deviation that has been allowed by the courts is the preservation of the integrity of political subdivisions and the following of natural boundaries when redrawing districts. But even in these cases, if the inequality falls much greater than 10 percent, the standard of population equality wins out over the political subdivision boundary. Attached to the report I have a listing of the few school districts which seem to fall into this classification, i.e. preserving political subdivision boundaries or following natural boundaries as a justification for larger population deviations. Such plans by schools which have been approved are plans which are close to the 10 percent deviation and which show marked population equality improvement over previous plans.

For the most part, school districts have been cooperating well. When they have attempted to redistrict they have greatly improved their population equality. Eddyville School District went from having the largest district exceeding the smallest district by 650 percent to only 2.68 percent!. Little Rock Community School District went from a 690.32 percent deviation to a 2.78 percent deviation. So if a school district puts forth a good-faith effort at achieving population equality, I don't think they will have trouble meeting the redistricting standards. Each case has to be reviewed on an individual basis, and each has its own peculiarities.

I have brought this to your attention as you might be hearing from some of your school districts which haven't had their plans approved by the state commissioner of elections.

275.23A Redistricting following federal decennial census.

1. School districts which have directors who represent director districts as provided in section 275.12, subsection 2, paragraphs *b* through *e*, shall be divided into director districts on the basis of population as determined from the most recent federal decennial census. The director districts shall be as nearly equal as practicable to the ideal population for the districts as determined by dividing the number of director districts to be established into the population of the school district. The director districts shall be composed of contiguous territory as compact as practicable.

2. If following a federal decennial census a school district fails to meet population equality requirements, the board of directors of the school district shall adopt a resolution redrawing the director districts not earlier than November 15 of the year immediately following the year in which the federal decennial census is taken nor later than May 30 of the second year immediately following the year in which the federal decennial census is taken. A copy of the adopted plan shall be filed with the area education agency administrator of the area education agency in which the school's electors reside.

3. The school board shall notify the state commissioner of elections and the county commissioner of elections of each county in which a portion of the school district is located whenever the boundaries of director districts are changed. The board shall provide the commissioners with maps showing the new boundaries. If, following a federal decennial census a school district elects not to redraw director districts under this section, the school board shall so certify to the state commissioner of elections, and the school board shall also certify to the state commissioner the populations of the retained director districts as determined under the latest federal decennial census. Upon failure of a district board to make the required changes by the dates established under this section, the state commissioner of elections shall make or cause to be made the necessary changes as soon as possible, and shall assess any expenses incurred to the school district. The state commissioner may request the services of personnel and materials available to the legislative service bureau to assist the commissioner in making any required boundary changes.

4. If more than one incumbent director, whose term extends beyond the organizational meeting of the board of directors after the regular school election following the adoption of the redrawn districts, reside in a redrawn director district, the terms of office of the affected directors expire at the organizational meeting of the board of directors following the next regular school election.

5. The boundary changes under this section take effect July 1 following their adoption for the next regular school election.

6. Section 275.9 and sections 275.14 through 275.23 do not apply to changes in director district boundaries made under this section.

(83 Acts, ch 77, § 3, 4) SF 485

School boards not in compliance with this section must redraw director districts by May 30, 1984

NEW section

SCHOOL NAME	HIGH DEVIATION	LOW DEVIATION	AVERAGE DEVIATION	H-L RATIO	A.P.	COMMENTS
ANITA COMMUNITY	3.51	3.51	3.51	1.0729	Y	Approved 3-14-84
B-G-M	114.96	44.02	45.98	3.8397	N	Brooklyn-Guernsey-Malcom rejected 3-25-84
BALLARD COMMUNITY	3.45	5.71	3.82	1.0971	Y	Rejected 3-15-84, defended 3-21-84, approved 5-17-84 Division based on county lines and natural boundaries (highway)
BEDFORD COMMUNITY	7.43	4.33	4.08	1.1229	N	Rejected 5-2-84, not contiguous Resubmitted old plan with change but still same pop. Lie?
BEDFORD LSB Revision	7.43	5.20	3.64	1.1332	N	Submitted 5-2-84 best plan from population blocks submitted
C & M COMMUNITY	5.93	8.43	4.65	1.1588	N	Rejected 5-7-84, needs more data
CARLISLE COMMUNITY	137.16	69.47	68.58	7.7673	N	Rejected 5-10-84, school indicated it would redistrict
CENTRAL DECATUR COMMUNITY	5.05	13.35	5.43	1.2154	N	Rejected 5-7-84, slight changes necessary to comply
CENTRAL DECATUR 2	4.98	3.85	1.95	1.0918	Y	Approved 5-18-84
CHARTER OAK-UTE COMMUNITY	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0000	Y	Approved 5-2-84 achieved absolute population equality!
CLARENCE-LOWDEN COMMUNITY	8.95	17.63	8.88	1.3227	N	Rejected 5-7-84, slight changes necessary to comply
CLARENCE-LOWDEN PLAN A	7.30	8.26	5.58	1.1697	N	Rejected 5-16-84, slight changes still necessary
CLARKE COMMUNITY	16.28	16.34	10.87	1.3899	N	Rejected 6-5-84
CLEAR CREEK COMMUNITY	56.74	66.11	50.90	4.6254	N	Rejected 5-10-84, school indicated is working on revision
CLEAR CREEK 2	8.59	4.29	4.32	1.1346	N	Rejected 6-7-84 need clarification-political sub justification?
DAVIS COUNTY COMMUNITY	33.41	8.74	9.56	1.4619	N	Rejected 5-7-84, school admitted need to resubmit
DAVIS COUNTY PLAN 2	5.51	9.90	4.72	1.1711	N	Rejected 5-21-84, slight changes needed.
DEEP RIVER-MILLERSBURG	2.22	2.22	2.22	1.0453	Y	Accepted 6-5-84
DECORAH COMMUNITY	4.28	8.53	5.70	1.1401	Y	Accepted 5-21-84, scheme based on city v. rural Improved from 584.16 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
DYSART-GENESCO COMMUNITY	4.40	3.97	3.83	1.0871	Y	Approved 5-7-84
EAST BUCHANAN COMMUNITY	51.82	60.86	40.54	3.8794	N	Rejected 5-7-84, school opposes all change
EDDYVILLE COMMUNITY	164.88	64.68	48.64	7.5000	N	Rejected 5-5-84
EDDYVILLE 2	1.22	1.42	0.61	1.0268	Y	Approved 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 99.59%!!
EDGEWOOD-COLESBURG	3.64	3.70	3.67	1.0762	Y	Approved 5-5-84
ELK HORN-KIMBALLTON	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.0000	Y	Approved 6-5-84 old plan had 281.51 percent deviation!
EVERLY COMMUNITY	14.17	7.22	6.94	1.2305	N	Rejected 5-7-84
EVERLY 2	2.17	3.25	1.96	1.0560	Y	Approved 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 75.70 percent.
FREMONT-MILLS COMMUNITY	26.97	25.59	16.38	1.7063	N	Rejected 5-7-84
FREMONT-MILLS 2	1.30	0.75	0.72	1.0209	Y	Approved 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 97.04 percent!
GLENWOOD COMMUNITY	160.47	77.51	80.21	11.5795	N	Rejected 5-5-84 But never sent as revised version received
GLENWOOD PLAN B	8.24	5.32	4.10	1.1432	Y	Accepted 5-21-84. Bad districts divided along township. Improved from 1057.95 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
GRAND COMMUNITY	47.51	25.79	24.34	1.9878	N	Rejected 5-8-84
GRINNELL-NEWBURG COMMUNITY	13.53	12.86	6.83	1.3028	N	Rejected 5-8-84
GRINNELL-NEWBURG 2	0.51	0.81	0.41	1.0133	Y	Accepted 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 95.61 percent!
HAMBURG COMMUNITY	3.19	3.64	1.82	1.0709	Y	Accepted 5-18-84
HARTLEY-MELVIN COMMUNITY	17.45	15.66	13.38	1.3925	N	Rejected 5-21-84
HOWARD-WINNESHIEK	1.93	2.63	1.86	1.0468	Y	Accepted 5-23-84
LE MARS COMMUNITY	10.47	14.85	11.78	1.2973	N	Rejected 5-21-84
LITTLE ROCK COMMUNITY	127.91	71.16	51.16	7.9032	N	Rejected 5-8-84
LITTLE ROCK 2	1.37	1.37	0.82	1.0278	Y	Accepted 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 99.60 percent!
MAQUOKETA VALLEY COMMUNITY	8.97	8.66	5.65	1.1931	N	Rejected 5-8-84, slight changes necessary to comply
MAQUOKETA VALLEY PLAN 2	0.21	0.21	0.12	1.0041	Y	Accepted 5-21-84
MARTENSDALE-ST. MARYS	18.28	8.81	8.06	1.2971	N	Rejected 5-10-84, slight changes should improve statistics
MARTENSDALE-ST. MARYS 2	1.76	2.86	1.15	1.0476	Y	Approved 6-6-84 reduced deviation by 83.98 percent.
MAURICE-ORANGE CITY	4.40	7.26	3.43	1.1259	N	Rejected 5-10-84, slight changes should improve statistics
MAURICE-ORANGE CITY PLAN-A	15.78	27.11	17.83	1.5806	N	Rejected 5-10-84, is alternative plan should voters accept
MIDLAND COMMUNITY	12.32	5.12	6.12	1.1838	N	Rejected 6-5-84, city boundary bad district, slight changes
MONTICELLO COMMUNITY	11.48	11.42	11.45	1.2590	N	Rejected 5-21-84
NISHNA VALLEY COMMUNITY	12.61	7.56	5.10	1.2182	N	Rejected 6-7-84 possibly not contiguous, slight changes Prior plan had 236.16 percent deviation.
NEW MARKET COMMUNITY	27.96	12.19	11.18	1.4571	N	Rejected 5-21-84
NORTH-LINN COMMUNITY	5.28	7.46	4.97	1.1377	N	Rejected 5-10-84, slight changes should improve statistics
OELWEIN COMMUNITY	78.00	65.95	62.37	5.2270	N	Rejected 5-10-84, district seems to resist any changes
OSKALOOSA COMMUNITY	4.88	7.12	3.67	1.1292	Y	Approved 5-21-84. Ward and township boundaries used. Improved from 433.89 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
POSTVIL COMMUNITY	70.13	33.79	35.09	2.569	N	Rejected 5-10-84, one district not contiguous
POSTVIL	13.33	9.68	2.81	1.254	N	Rejected 5-18-84, slight change in city necessary

PRESCOTT COMMUNITY	1.67	2.78	2.00	1.0457	Y	Accepted	6-5-84
ROLFE COMMUNITY	189.45	63.27	75.78	7.8812	N	Rejected	5-10-84
SHELDON COMMUNITY	15.35	11.17	10.22	1.2985	N	Rejected	5-10-84, slight changes necessary
SHELDON PLAN	4.37	4.14	2.90	1.0889	Y	Accepted	5-21-84
SIDNEY COMMUNITY	45.30	46.83	32.30	2.7325	N	Rejected	5-10-84
SIOUX VALLEY COMMUNITY	17.85	10.77	7.14	1.3208	N	Rejected	6-7-84
STARMONT COMMUNITY	4.94	4.12	3.31	1.0944	Y	Accepted	5-10-84, township boundaries used, small deviations
STUART-MENLO COMMUNITY	16.07	10.03	8.46	1.2901	N	Rejected	5-11-84
STUART-MENLO 2	2.51	1.81	0.97	1.0440	Y	Approved	6-6-84 reduced deviation by 84.83 percent
VALLEY COMMUNITY	5.41	6.84	4.42	1.1314	N	Rejected	5-21-84, slight changes should improve
WASHINGTON COMMUNITY	50.38	29.36	19.85	2.1288	N	Rejected	5-11-84, one district in three pieces--not contiguous
WASHINGTON PLAN 2	0.90	1.03	0.39	1.0195	Y	Accepted	5-24-84 Deviation reduced by over 98 percent!
WEST LYON COMMUNITY	9.96	9.18	7.21	1.2107	N	Rejected	5-11-84, slight changes should improve statistics
WEST LYON 2	4.65	2.10	1.86	1.0689	Y	Approved	6-6-84 reduced deviation by 67.30 percent
WINTERSET COMMUNITY	9.90	9.90	9.90	1.2197	N	Rejected	5-21-84

SCHOOL NAME	HIGH DEVIATION	LOW DEVIATION	AVERAGE DEVIATION	H-L RATIO	A. P.	COMMENTS
BALLARD COMMUNITY	3.45	5.71	3.82	1.0971	Y	Rejected 3-15-84, defended 3-21-84, accepted 5-17-84 Division based on county line plus natural boundaries (highway)
CLEAR CREEK 2	8.59	4.29	4.32	1.1346	N	Rejected 6--7-84 sought clarification if justification based on political subdivision boundaries is present--sent poor qual map
DAVIS COUNTY PLAN 2	5.51	9.90	4.72	1.1711	N	Rejected 5-21-84. Township lines. But too great, slight ch nec
DECORAH COMMUNITY	4.28	8.53	5.70	1.1401	Y	Approved 5-21-84. Scheme based on city v. rural division. Improved from 584.16 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
GLENWOOD PLAN B	8.24	5.32	4.10	1.1432	Y	Approved 5-21-84. Two bad districts divided along township. Improved from 1057.98 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
HARTLEY--MELVIN COMMUNITY	17.45	15.66	13.38	1.3925	N	Rejected 5-21-84
LE MARS COMMUNITY	10.47	14.85	11.78	1.2973	N	Rejected 5-21-84
MIDLAND COMMUNITY	12.32	5.12	6.12	1.1838	N	Rejected 6-5-84 city 1, rest evenly divided, but too great. Slight changes necessary. Improved from 90% deviation.
MONTICELLO COMMUNITY	11.48	11.42	11.45	1.2590	N	Rejected 5-21-84
OSKALOOSA COMMUNITY	4.88	7.12	3.67	1.1292	Y	Approved 5-21-84. Division on ward and township boundaries. Improved from 433.89 percent deviation. Good-faith effort.
WINTERSET COMMUNITY	9.90	9.90	9.90	1.2197	N	Rejected 5-21-84

REPORT OF THE
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL COMMITTEE
TO THE
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

JUNE 12, 1984

The Legislative Fiscal Committee met at 10:00 A.M. on June 11, 1984 in Room 24. Members present were:

Senator Arthur Small, Jr., Co-Chair
Representative Thomas Jochum, Co-Chair
Senator Edgar Holden
Senator C. W. Bill Hutchins
Representative Minnette Doderer
Representative Lowell Norland
Representative Hugo Schnekloth
Representative Richard Welden

Also present were Legislative Fiscal Bureau staff and other interested persons.

In the absence of Senator Small at the morning session, Representative Jochum presided. The May minutes were approved. Pat Hipple presented a review of the AEA evaluation. The Committee adopted the following recommendation:

Recommends to the Legislative Council that an interim study committee, the Education Committee, address the recommendations set forth in the program evaluation on the AEA's to determine if and what corrective legislation be written.

The Committee also requested that a letter be written requesting an Attorney General's opinion regarding the charging of user fees by the area education agencies.

Thom Freyer presented possible program evaluations for Committee consideration and authorization. The Committee adopted the following recommendation:

Recommends that the Legislative Council authorize the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to conduct a program evaluation of the Dispute Resolution Centers.

The Fiscal Committee will continue to review the Program Evaluation proposal relating to the Regent's Developmental Leaves (sabbaticals) at the state universities.

Chris Gaare gave a brief history of Comparable Worth. Ms. Gaare, along with Clint Davis, Merit Employment Department and Bill Snyder, Comptroller's Office, answered questions from the Committee. Further discussion on Comparable Worth will be conducted at the next meeting of the Fiscal Committee.

Chairperson Jochum called on Mary Ellis, Director of the Department of Substance Abuse. Ms. Ellis spoke to the funding formula used by the Department. Ms. Ellis distributed three handouts and answered questions from the Committee.

The meeting was adjourned.

REPORT OF THE STUDIES COMMITTEE
to the
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

June 12, 1984

The Studies Committee of the Legislative Council met at 9:15 a.m. in Committee Room 22 of the State House to review requests for interim studies and submits the following report:

1. That the mandated studies for a Comparable Worth Steering Committee and an Agriculture, Food & Energy Demonstration Center Study Committee be reconsidered and disapproved.

2. That a legislative interim committee be established to monitor implementation of Senate File 2359. The study committee shall consist of three members of the Senate and three members of the House and be authorized four meeting days.

3. That the following 1984 LEAG proposals be approved:

a. The Causes and Policy Implications of the Recent Decline in the Iowa Livestock Production and Meat Processing Industries (\$6,000).

b. Economic changes in the Iowa Livestock Meat Processing Industry (\$1,400).

c. The Impact of Federal Banking Deregulations on Consumers, Business and Governments: Policy Implications for Iowa (\$5,694).

d. Out of state Use at Selected Iowa Recreation Areas and its Income Generating Potential (\$6,360).

e. LEAG Administrative Expenses (\$5,000).

4. That the Education Task Force be authorized 2 additional meeting days.

5. That a Code Publication Subcommittee be established consisting of three members of the Senate and three members of the House and be authorized one meeting day.

6. That a Livestock Industry Study Committee be established consisting of three members of the Senate and three members of the House with one meeting day.

7. That a Recreation-Tourism Study Committee be established and authorized 4 meeting days. The scope of the study and membership of the Study Committee is outlined in the attachment.

8. That a request by the Legislative Fiscal Committee for an interim study committee to review the program evaluation on Area Education Agencies be deferred until the next meeting.

9. That the Speaker of the House after consultation with the House majority leader, the House minority leader and the Senate majority and minority leaders appoint the members of the study committees with the approval of the Legislative Council.

Respectfully submitted,

SENATOR LOWELL L. JUNKINS
Chairman

STUDIES AND MEMBERSHIP FOR 1984 INTERIM

June 12, 1984

*Indicates Temporary Co-Chair

<u>STUDY SUBJECT</u>	<u>COMMITTEE STRUCTURE</u>	<u>NO. MBRS.</u>	<u>MTG. DAYS</u>	<u>SENATORS</u>	<u>MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATIVES</u>	<u>STAFF</u>
<u>STUDIES IN PROGRESS</u>						
1. Tax Study Committee		11 Public	No Limit			
2. Education Task Force		7 Public				
a. Higher Education Subcommittee		6 Public				
b. Student Responsi- bility & Disci- pline Subcommittee		7 Public				
c. Education Framework Subcommittee		7 Public				
d. Curriculum Subcommittee		8 Public				
e. Teaching Quality Subcommittee		8 Public				
f. Education & Industry Subcommittee		6 Public				

MANDATED STUDIES

1. Political Campaign Study Committee (SF 2014)		11 Public	2			
2. Public Records Study Committee (SF 2294)		5 Senate 5 House	2			

<u>STUDY SUBJECT</u>	<u>COMMITTEE STRUCTURE</u>	<u>NO. MBRs.</u>	<u>MTG DAYS</u>	<u>SENATORS</u>	<u>MEMBERSHIP REPRESENTATIVES</u>
3. Drunk Driving Study Committee (HF 2486)		10	2		
4. Mental Health Reorganization Study Committee (1982 IA Acts, Ch. 1117)		5 Senate 5 House	1		

COUNCIL STUDIES

1. Export and Trade Center Study Committee		7 Senate 7 House	4		
2. Cattle Industry Study Committee		3 Senate 3 House	1		
3. Comparable Worth Study Committee		3 Senate 3 House	4		
4. Code Publication Subcommittee		3 Senate 3 House	1		
5. Recreation-Tourism Study Committee		6 Senate 6 House	4		

R E P O R T
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE
of the

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

June 12, 1984

The Administration Committee of the Legislative Council met at 1:20 p.m. on Tuesday, June 12, 1984, to consider proposals for the purchase of carpeting for the Legislative Service Bureau offices, additional furniture for the Code Editing Office, authorization for the publication of an election law manual, and renewal of a contract for composition of the 1985 Code of Iowa.

The Committee makes the following recommendations:

1. That the Legislative Council accept the bid of Triplett Office Essentials Corporation for carpeting for the Legislative Service Bureau offices for not to exceed \$15,000 as proposed in the attached letter from Mr. Serge H. Garrison dated May 30, 1984.

2. That the Legislative Council approve the publication of an election laws manual for sale for cost of publication including labor.

3. That the Legislative Council accept renewal of a contract with Compositors, Inc., for composition of the 1985 Code of Iowa as proposed in the attached letter from Mr. Robert Worley, President, Compositors, Inc.

4. That further action on the proposal for additional funding for furniture for the Code Editing Office be deferred pending additional information on the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN H. CONNORS
Chairman

adm612
tj/dg/56H

IOWA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL
 Representative Donald D. Anderson, Chairperson
 Senator Lowell L. Jenkins, Vice Chairperson
 IOWA LEGISLATIVE SERVICE BUREAU
 STATE HOUSE
 DES MOINES, IOWA 50319
 TELEPHONE 515 281-3888
 SERGE H. GARRISON, DIRECTOR

LEGAL DIVISION
 ATTORNEY GENERAL
 DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
 DEPARTMENT OF WORKERS COMPENSATION
 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY
 DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES
 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
 DEPARTMENT OF CULTURE AND ARTS
 DEPARTMENT OF LAND AND NATURAL RESOURCES
 DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

RESEARCH DIVISION
 IOWA SCIENCE CENTER
 IOWA POLITICAL CENTER
 IOWA HISTORICAL SOCIETY
 IOWA ARCHIVES

IOWA LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS
 U.S. SENATOR ROBERT D. DODD, R-Iowa
 U.S. SENATOR BOB DODD, R-Iowa

SENATORS	REPRESENTATIVES
James E. Bales	David M. Blanton
Donald Coleman	William J. Bongers
Donald D. Cook	Bert Hoffmann-Bright
Merlin D. Felt	Thomas J. Cochran
David D. Harman	Dean L. DeLoe
John H. Johnson	Lester D. Menke
Charles F. Miller	Lowell E. Norland
William A. Snape	Edward Stroner
Carl L. Teser	Richard W. Neider

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

FROM: Serge H. Garrison, Director, Legislative Service Bureau

RE: Purchase of carpet for LSB offices

DATE: May 30, 1984

The present carpeting in the Legislative Service Bureau is wearing out in many of the heavy traffic areas to the point that we have a safety hazard which is increasing in severity. I had hoped to present some cost figures on replacing the carpet in early April but because of the session schedule and no appropriate meeting time for the Council I was not able to do so. I did consult with General Services early in the session and the department did give me an estimate based upon the department's dealings with various vendors. The estimate at that time was \$15,272. I want to use this fiscal year's funds because next year's budget may not be very flexible. It was suggested in March that an interior consultant be employed to provide assistance with the selection of the carpeting which would have cost an additional \$500. Installation would have required using buildings and grounds employees during the day which would greatly disrupt this office. I did not feel there was adequate time for this issue at the May Legislative Council meeting. Recently, I decided to check another source, that being Triplett Office Essentials Corporation, a company which provides LSB with some of its office supplies. This company has its own interior consultant available at no extra cost but she is, of course, interested in selling that company's products. That company gave a bid of \$14,357.14 for a very fine quality carpet which includes moving all furniture during evenings and weekends, removal of old carpeting, and installation before July 1, 1984. There would be some extra charge for pad replacement but since the existing pad appears to be in fine shape, we do not anticipate a great expense. In no event would the cost exceed \$15,000. They

TO: Legislative Service Bureau

June 11, 1984

FROM: Vern Lundquist, Superintendent of Printing *VL*

SUBJECT: Typesetting of the 1985 Code of Iowa

On January 5, 1982, we entered into a contract with Compositors, Inc. of Cedar Rapids for composition of the 1983 Code of Iowa. The contract price at that time was \$3.85 per page.

I have discussed this contract with Bob Worley of Compositors, Inc. and he would like to renew this contract for the 1985 Code of Iowa. The contract price for the 1985 Code would be \$3.62 per page. The reason for the cost reduction is that the per page cost for 1983 included some one time programming charges. A renewal of the contract will allow us to take advantage of this price reduction.

I recommend that we renew this contract for at least one more issue of the Code for two reasons. The first is that we will realize a reduction in cost because it would be necessary to pay new programming costs to a new contractor if one were found and the second is that it would not be necessary to familiarize a new contractor of the requirements of composition of the Code of Iowa. This last item, as you well know, would be a great time saver.

A copy of Compositors' proposal is attached.

Members of the Administration Committee

May 29, 1984

Page 2

have a portion of the carpeting in stock but the rest would have to be ordered soon in order to install this June and thus use fiscal 1983-84 funds.

I cannot assure Triplett that the Administration Committee and the Council will approve this proposal until final action on June 12, 1984, which means the carpeting will not be available before July 1, 1984 because it must be ordered now. I feel that it is in the best interest of the state to install new carpeting because of the safety factor, the price, and the convenience of installing the carpeting at night and on a weekend, which Triplett has agreed to do. I do not expect you to approve this purchase without a meeting, but I would like to tell Triplett that I have informed the Administration Committee of the facts and the members have not indicated any strong objections (unless, of course, you do), and if they will take their chances and order the carpeting now, we might be able to close this transaction on the 12th of June. They would be ordering subject to Council approval and there would be no obligation to complete the transaction if the Council did not approve the purchase.

Now that I have informed you of the situation, please indicate to me as soon as possible if you have any doubts about the merit of the proposal. It would be difficult for me to make this purchase solely out of fiscal 84-85 funds. I might be able to use part of 83-84 funds and part of 84-85 funds, but that assumes part of the project will be completed this fiscal year.

I appreciate your attention.

R E P O R T
of the
SERVICE COMMITTEE

June 12, 1984

The Service Committee met on Tuesday, June 12, 1984, and makes the following recommendations to the Legislative Council:

1. That the Legislative Service Bureau, the Legislative Fiscal Bureau, the Office of Citizens' Aide, and the Code Consultant's Office will work toward using the same pay matrix as is used by the House and Senate with the employees placed on specific steps in their pay grades and will work toward equity in salaries among the legislative employees with similar job responsibilities.
2. That the proposed budget allocations for the 1984-1985 fiscal year for the Legislative Service Bureau, the Legislative Fiscal Bureau, the Office of Citizens' Aide and the Code Consultant's Office be approved as submitted to the Service Committee and the Legislative Council.
3. That the proposed salaries for employees of the Legislative Fiscal Bureau and the Office of Citizens' Aide for the 1984-1985 fiscal year be approved as submitted to the Service Committee and the Legislative Council.
4. That the proposed salaries for employees of the Legislative Service Bureau for the 1984-1985 fiscal year be approved as submitted to the Service Committee and the Legislative Council except that Gary Kaufman's salary should be \$29,390.80.
5. That Ms. Phyllis Barry will submit to the Legislative Council proposed salaries for her employees for the 1984-1985 fiscal year.
6. That the Legislative Service Bureau, the ^{Office of Citizens' Aide} ~~Legislative Fiscal Bureau~~, and the Code Consultant's Office will submit charts to the Service Committee listing each employee, the employee's grade, the employee's salary for the 1984-1985 fiscal year and where the employee's salary lies in relationship to the closest step in that grade.
7. That the Office of Citizens' Aide be authorized to hire on an as-needed basis at an hourly wage of \$5.75 a part-time clerical assistant to help with the typing backlog.
8. That the outside employment policy proposed by the Office of Citizens' Aide be adopted as submitted to the Service Committee

and the Legislative Council.

9. That Ms. Ruth Bender be employed by the Legislative Fiscal Bureau as a Legislative Analyst I at Pay Grade 24, Step 2.

Respectfully submitted,

SENATOR C. W. (Bill) HUTCHINS
Chairman

service612
db/dg/56H

REPORT OF THE STUDIES COMMITTEE
to the
LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

June 12, 1984

The Studies Committee of the Legislative Council met at 9:15 a.m. in Committee Room 22 of the State House to review requests for interim studies and submits the following report:

1. That the mandated studies for a Comparable Worth Steering Committee and an Agriculture, Food & Energy Demonstration Center Study Committee be reconsidered and disapproved.

2. That a legislative interim committee be established to monitor implementation of Senate File 2359. The study committee shall consist of three members of the Senate and three members of the House and be authorized four meeting days.

3. That the following 1984 LEAG proposals be approved:

a. The Causes and Policy Implications of the Recent Decline in the Iowa Livestock Production and Meat Processing Industries (\$6,000).

b. Economic changes in the Iowa Livestock Meat Processing Industry (\$1,400).

c. The Impact of Federal Banking Deregulations on Consumers, Business and Governments: Policy Implications for Iowa (\$5,694).

d. Out of state Use at Selected Iowa Recreation Areas and its Income Generating Potential (\$6,360).

e. LEAG Administrative Expenses (\$5,000).

4. That the Education Task Force be authorized 2 additional meeting days.

5. That a Recreation-Tourism Study Committee be established and authorized 4 meeting days. The scope of the study and membership of the Study Committee is outlined in the attachment.

6. That a request by the Legislative Fiscal Committee for an interim study committee to review the program evaluation on Area Education Agencies be deferred until the next meeting.

7. That the Speaker of the House after consultation with the House majority leader, the House minority leader and the Senate majority and minority leaders appoint the members of the study committees with the approval of the Legislative Council.

Respectfully submitted,

SENATOR LOWELL L. JUNKINS
Chairman

REPORT TITLE: Recreation/Tourism/Leisure in Iowa - An Assessment

REPORT SUBTITLE: A Socio/Economic Evaluation With Recommendation for Action

STUDY OBJECTIVE: Undertake a R/T/L analysis of Iowa in relation to the needs of our citizens, visitors to the state, and the states comparable position in the region and the nation and to identify specific needs and opportunities.

PROPOSED MEMBERSHIP: Non-Legislative:
Iowa Natural Heritage Foundation (to Serve as Chair)
Iowa Conservation Commission
Iowa Development Commission
Governor's Office

Legislative:
6 Senate, 6 House

PROPOSED SCOPE OF STUDY:

1. Analyze the current delivery system and the relative roles of the private sector, and the federal, state, county and local governments (supply side) \$15,000
2. Statewide analysis of participation by Iowans and visitors to the State (Demand Side) \$35,000
3. Evaluation of studies and programs, nationally, regionally of other states, leading to a definition of Iowa's balance of trade. \$10,000-20,000
4. Utilize the data obtained in items 1,2, & 3 above to define and identify areas of special needs and opportunities \$20,000
5. Recommendations: (a) Legislative
(b) Policy/Programs \$5,000
(c) Financial

TIME FRAME: 12-18 months

ESTIMATED COST:

1.	\$15,000	
2.	35,000	
3.	10,000 - 20,000	
4.	20,000	
5.	5,000	
	\$85,000	Total

CONFIDENTIAL

715 THIRD STREET NORTH WEST, CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA 52405. TELEPHONE 319-366-355.

June 4, 1984

Vern Lundquist
State of Iowa
Printing Division, Grimes St.
Des Moines, Iowa 50319

Dear Vern,

I would like to submit to you a quotation of \$3.62 per page for the production of the up coming Code of Iowa.

I have spoken to our programmer about the Code Program and he feels it is running real well. The changes you mentioned should not cause a problem and will be added to the program as needed.

Our price of \$3.62 is approximately 6% less than we did it for in 1982. If I can be of further assistance please contact me.

Sincerely,

Bob

Robert D. Worley
President