KAY LUTHER

May 13, 1986

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Senator Dole
FROM: Lynda
SUBJECT: Appearance Before the Iowa Chamber of Commerce

Wednesday Appearance Before the Iowa Chamber

You are scheduled to speak before this group on Wednesday between 12:30 and 1:00 for 5 or 10 minutes. Thus far, the only other member scheduled to address them is Congressman Kemp. Betty has made sure that there will be a significant time difference between your and Kemp's remarks.

Point of Concern

The Chamber will try to get a commitment from you to support their position on construction of an area wide sewage treatment facility. That position essentially consists of desiring (1) the House version of the Clean Water Act bill giving Des Moines $85 million for this project; (2) an extension of the deadline that Iowa has to comply with the standards; and (3) retention of the current level of construction grant funding.

Note that Iowa elected to participate in the Federal 208 planning process back in the 70s. Inflation and the curtailment of government spending have necessitated the possibility of having to increase state taxes to meet the mandated deadline. Be prepared for a lot of dumping on the President and EPA.

Substance of the Issue

Needless to say, the Iowa version of this issue and Morris Kay's account are quite different. You should know:

- The House and Senate have both passed amendments to the Clean Water Act. The House version, H. R. 8, contains an $85 million appropriation for the Iowa sewage treatment facility. The Senate version changes the present construction grant formula, resulting in a $3 million reduction in Iowa's formula. Morris Kay terms the $85 million appropriation as pure pork barrel.

- In addition to asking you to support the $85 million provision in the House bill and the retention of the current level of Construction Grant Program funding, you will also be asked to support the moving of the compliance deadline of June 1, 1991 to December 31, 1992. (Note: Original deadline of 1988 has already been moved back to 1991.)

- Morris Kay has been meeting with Iowans on this issue on a regular basis. Says that he has been trying to draw criticism away from Chuck Grassley to himself.

- There is a meeting scheduled on Wednesday afternoon with the Under Secretary at EPA. You might refer to that meeting and state that you will follow the issue and would be interested in hearing outcome of meeting.

- Grassley is meeting with Republican conferees; Harkin with Democrats.

5/8/86

Tax Reform in the Senate

• The Senate Finance Committee has done the country proud by producing the most far-reaching tax reform bill in history: and approving it by an overwhelming 20-0 vote. They said we couldn't beat the special interests--they were wrong.

• Tax reform in the Senate means the lowest income tax rates since 1931. The new rates are 15% up to $29,300 in income (joint returns), and 27% above that income level. On the corporate side, the rate is 33%.

• It also means significant tax reductions for working people in America, particularly the lowest-income wage-earners. 6 million low-income Americans will be taken off the tax rolls completely as a result of tax reform. The personal exemption will go up to $1,900 in 1987 and $2,000 in 1988. The standard deduction will go up to $5,000 for joint returns.

• Taxpayers with incomes of $10,000 or less get a 62% tax reduction; between $10,000 and $20,000, an 18% tax reduction; between $30,000 and $40,000, a 5% reduction; and between $40,000 and $50,000, a 6.5% reduction.

• These low, low tax rates are made possible by a major crackdown on unjustified tax shelters for the rich, and by eliminating many deductions, exemptions, credits, and the like. But mortgage interest, charitable contributions, and State and local income and property taxes remain deductible.

• A stiff new minimum tax ensures that no wealthy individual or corporation can avoid paying their fair share of tax.

Productive for the economy

• This bill achieves, in a big way, the major economic goal of tax reform: establishing a 'level playing field' by taking the juice out of special tax breaks. If we can get this bill signed into law, people will be able to make their financial and economic decisions without worrying so much about tax consequences--and that's a very healthy thing for the economy.

• In addition, the Senate bill creates a much healthier climate for investment and productivity than the House-passed bill. Depreciation allowances are more realistic, and more neutral among various industries than under the House bill.

• Simply put, lower tax rates for all taxpayers are bound to the premium out of planning your finances for the purpose of tax avoidance. And getting rid of some long-standing tax differentials--like capital gains rates, deductions for most interest payments, and dropping the investment credit--advances the same goal. From now on, straight marketplace judgment is what counts most--not creative tax accounting.

Last step in the process

• The new high-water mark on tax reform represented in the Finance Committee bill is the culmination of years of hard work in reducing and stabilizing tax rates and broadening the tax base. The groundwork for tax reform was laid in 1981 when, under my Chairmanship, the Finance Committee led the way for President Reagan's tax-rate cuts and initiated tax indexing to keep those lower rates in place, regardless of inflation.

• The next step was to resort to closing loopholes, improving compliance, and removing special preferences as a way to raise revenue, rather than re-imposing high tax rates on working Americans. That was done in both 1982 and 1984 under the Dole Finance Committee.

• The net effect of this was to point the way to a lower-rate, broader-based, fairer and more productive tax system. Tax indexing and accelerated depreciation were sort of like the Gramm-Rudman of the tax code: they force us to make choices we ought to have been making all along, and to face the fact that our tax code had become a maze of special preferences and privileges that had outlived their usefulness.

• Now let's finish the job: and achieve true tax reform for all Americans.

May 9, 1986

TAX RATES

- The individual tax rates in the Finance Committee bill are 15 and 27 percent. 80 percent of families will be in the 15 percent bracket.
- To make sure that wealthier taxpayers do not receive a disproportionate tax cut, the benefits of the 15 percent bracket and of the increased personal exemption are phased out for high income taxpayers.

Recapture of Benefit of the 15% Bracket

- The benefit of the 15 percent rate bracket is recaptured for taxpayers filing joint returns who have incomes over $75,000. This is done by a gradual phase-in so that the dollar value of the lower rate is not entirely lost unless the taxpayer has more than $145,320 in income.
- The provision is drafted as a phase-out to avoid what we call a "cliff". We did not think it would be fair to tell taxpayers who have $75,001 of income to pay tax on all of it at the 27% rate, while taxpayers with $74,999 in income pay tax at the 15 percent rate.
- However, the way it is drafted gives commentators an opportunity to say that the "marginal" tax rate for families between $75,000 and $145,320 is 32 percent instead of 27 percent.
- The important thing to remember is that their effective tax rate never will exceed 27 percent and that, even at 32 percent, the rate is below the 38 percent in the House bill and 35 percent in the President's proposals.

(N.B. The phaseout for single taxpayers begins at $45,000.)

Phaseout of Personal Exemption

- The Committee bill phases out the personal exemption for families between $145,320 and $185,320.
- I understand that the effect of this is to raise the marginal rate for these taxpayers to 28 percent, although, as I mentioned earlier, the effective rate never exceeds 27 percent.

- However, for taxpayers in this income range, the rate is significantly less than the 50 percent rate in current law, as well as the rates proposed by the President and passed by the House.

- Some will argue that the Finance Committee bill raises the tax rate on long-term capital gains too much. I can understand their concern, but over 70 percent of the benefit from the capital gains exclusion is taken by individuals making over $250,000 a year. These taxpayers will have a tax rate of 27 percent. That should be sufficient.

May 9, 1986

Individual Retirement Accounts

- Senator Packwood's 25% proposal included repeal of IRA's for everyone. His 27% proposal as it was adopted by the Finance Committee includes my suggestion to retain fully deductible IRA's for people who are not covered by pension plans. This change meant that the proposal would raise $19 billion less over 5 years than full repeal.

- Senator Chafee's amendment which the Committee adopted broadened IRA's a little more by allowing individuals who are covered by pension plans to make nondeductible IRA contributions. The income earned on these investments would remain tax-deferred until it is withdrawn from the IRA.

- The Chafee amendment cost $1.6 billion over five years. Of course, since the "inside buildup" will grow over the years, the revenue cost in the future will be substantially greater.

- These changes, therefore, restored over $20 bilion of the $46 billion that would have been gained by repeal of IRA's altogether.

Misconceptions

- Individuals who now have IRA's will be able to keep the amounts they have already invested without any change in tax effect. They will also be able to contribute up to $2,000 each year ($2,250 for IRA's with a spousal feature) in the future. The only difference is that only individuals not covered by a pension plan will be able to take a deduction for the contribution. In every case, income earned on amounts invested in an IRA will remain tax-free until they are withdrawn from the IRA.

- There has been much discussion about the loss of the deduction for some individuals. Two things seem to have been ignored in the debate so far. First, 80 percent of all families will have their tax rate reduced to 15 percent. At this rate, the deduction on a maximum $2,000 contribution is worth only $300. With the low rate, double personal exemption and larger standard deduction, virtually all these taxpayers will have a substantial tax cut despite the loss of an IRA deduction. Of course, many people do not contribute the maximum $2,000 and the deduction is even less important for them.

- Second, the value of the tax-deferral on the income earned in IRA's is the most significant feature from a tax-saving point of view. That feature is still retained in every case.

- In addition, I should point out that more and more employers are adding 401(k) plans as part of the pension package they offer to their employees.

- 401(k) plans are equivalent to IRA's in tax effect except that the maximum annual contribution is $7,000. I expect that, if the Finance Committee's IRA rules are included in the legislation sent to the President, the rate of new 401(k) plans will accelerate.

- If I am right on this, we basically have a fight not about the level of retirement savings, but about who holds these savings. Will it be the banks and insurance companies who administer pension plans or the banks, mutual funds, and other financial institutions who sell IRA's?

Who Takes the IRA Deduction
(Percentages Rounded)

Adjusted Gross Income (1983 figures)	Percent of All Tax Returns	Percent of All IRA Deductions
Below $10,000	36.0%	3.2%
$10,000-$19,999	25.6	11.2
$20,000-$29,999	16.8	18.7
$30,000-$39,999	10.8	21.1
$40,000-$49,999	5.3	17.4
$50,000-$74,999	3.7	18.0
$75,000-$99,999	.8	5.2
$100,000 and up	.8	5.1

May 8, 1986

Real Estate Talking Points

- The tax reform bill reported by the Finance Committee will be very effective in reducing tax considerations as a part of investment decision making.

- With a 27 percent maximum tax rate, individuals will have little incentive to invest in tax shelters. For that reason alone the limitation on the deduction of passive losses will be much less important than it would be if rates were left where they are under present law or under the House bill.

- In addition, with the capital cost recovery period for residential real estate increased to 27 1/2 years and the recovery period for commercial real estate increased to 31 1/2 years, there is little artificial incentive left in depreciation deductions.

- That does not mean that some individuals who have invested in recent years will not be disadvantaged by the new rules.

- Whether it is good policy or not, it has been completely legal for individuals to offset other income by deductions derived from real estate and other investments. It would not be fair to change the rules without giving these individuals some time to rearrange their investments.

- For that reason, although I was a member of the so-called "core group", I refused to support the Chairman's package until a transition rule was included. We were able to convince Senator Packwood to adopt first a 3-year phase-in of the passive loss limitation and later a 4-year phase-in. I tried to extend the phase-in to 5 years, but there were not enough votes for additional relief. Perhaps some additional relief will be possible on the floor, but at least we were able to moderate the immediate short-term effect of the passive loss limitations.

May 9, 1986

PASSIVE LOSS LIMITATION

EXCEPTION FOR OIL AND GAS WORKING INTERESTS

- The Finance Committee bill contains an exception from the passive loss limitation rule for "working interests in oil and gas properties".

- First, I would like to clear up a misconception in the reports by the media. There was no threat to kill the tax reform effort if this modification were not adopted. This modification was included in this bill just like any other modification -- a majority of the Committee thought it was a good idea and voted for it.

- The passive loss limitation rule is the provision that has been described as the "anti-tax shelter" provision. This provision raises approximately $50 billion over five years by telling investors in tax shelters that they can use deductions generated from these investments to offset income generated by these types of investments, but they cannot use these deductions to offset other income such as salary or wages.

- The working interest exception recognizes the economic reality in the way some oil and gas deals are structured differs greatly from real estate or other types of investment.

- Those of us who voted for this exception believe that when an individual enters into a joint venture to drill an oil well and agrees that he will be joint and severally liable for any costs that may result, he is in the business of oil drilling. He is not just a passive investor.

- These individuals receive detailed explanations of proposed expenditures before they are incurred and they have the ability to challenge the specifics and to put up funds or not. They are truly in the business whether or not they actually operate the drilling rig.

- In contrast, if an individual is a limited partner in a so-called oil fund, he will be treated just like other passive investors and the loss limitations will apply.

- The working interest exception represents $1.4 billion out of $50 billion attributed to the passive loss limitation. It is clear that the exception does not materially reduce the value of the general rule.

- In fact, it has almost exactly the same revenue impact as the 3-year extension of the targeted jobs credit which we agreed to the same evening we agreed to the working interest rule. I have not seen any stories about the $1.3 billion loss attributable to these credits.

- Similarly, the research and development credit was extended for 4 years at $1 billion per year. It is an incentive, not an economic cost, but no one has written about that. No one has discussed the credit for historic and other older buildings which cost $2 billion per year and have been the basis for countless tax shelters.

May 13, 1986

BUDGET TALKING POINTS

o At one o'clock in the morning on May 2, the Senate fulfilled its obligation under Gramm-Rudman-Hollings and approved a spending blueprint for fiscal 1987 that meets the $144 billion deficit target.

o Ours was a bipartisan effort. 38 Republicans and 28 Democrats voted for the revamped Domenici-Chiles budget.

o And the budget we approved is an honest, straightforward attempt to deal with economic realities -- not by making defense a whipping boy and not by tax overkill.

o Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the House budget, which the House Budget Committee reported out on a party-line vote (21-11). The House budget has a $138 billion deficit figure for 1987, but it was achieved by gutting defense spending. This budget decreases 1987 spending authority to $285 billion from the administration's original $320 billion request.

o Many think the Senate went too far when it reduced defense to $301 billion -- but the House's $285 billion level is totally irresponsible and totally unrealistic.

o House debate on their budget resolution has not been scheduled. But between now and whenever the final vote comes, I hope a majority of House members will see the folly in that budget plan. Congress, the House and Senate, has made decisions about national security that are now being carried out. We made commitments that are essential to our safety and security. We can not, we should not back out of those obligations now. There is much more at stake than political gain.

o The Senate faced up to the promise it made to deficit reduction when it passed Gramm-Rudman-Hollings. We did not turn our back on the budget process, we were not willing to roll the dice and hope that the Gods will save us from sequester. Now, it's up to the House to be responsible as well.

o This budget, though far from perfect, addressed some of the basic concerns I, and a number of senators had with the Senate Budget Committee's resolution.

o First, the revenue increase is substantially lower than the Senate Budget Committee's plan. Over three years revenues would be increased $45 billion, rather than the $74.3 billion in the SBC budget.

o Second, we added reasonable, but essential funds for defense. For fiscal 1987, defense spending authority would be $301 billion -- $6 billion more than the SBC's resolution.

o Finally, we were able to accomplish these changes because we went back and made substantial reductions in non-defense spending. In 1987 alone, we saved an additional $8.7 billion in these programs -- and over the next three years, these program reforms will yield $25 billion in savings.

The Deficit and the Average American

- o Unless we follow a deficit reduction path like that mandated under Gramm-Rudman, American families will face either higher interest rates or higher inflation: not to mention the risk of a disastrous new recession throwing millions of breadwinners out of work. That is what the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings initiative is all about.

- o Most economists believe that enactment of deficit reduction measures that eliminate the deficit by the end of the decade will produce a drop of at least 1 percent in interest rates over the short run and 2 to 3 percentage points over the long term: relative to what they otherwise would be.

  -- With a 2% drop in interest rates, the monthly payment on a median priced home ($80,000) would go down by about $100 a month.

  -- Conversely, if we don't reduce the deficit to keep rates as low as they are now, homeowners could face that large an increase--or more-- in monthly payments.

  -- A 2% drop in interest rates would mean an additional $4,000 in income for the average wheat farmer with a 1,000 acre operation.

  -- In 1985, the Federal Government overspent to the tune of $1,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

  -- This $1,000 per head of additional federal debt will be one more burden for our children to repay in higher taxes or higher inflation in the future.

<u>Interest on the Debt</u>

The massive increase in debt has itself created one of the largest and fastest growing components of Federal spending--interest on the debt. Constant deficits have put fiscal policy on an endless treadmill of paying for the irresponsibility of previous decades:

- In 1965, interest on the national debt cost $9 billion and consumed 1.4% of GNP. By 1980, annual interest costs rose to $52 billion--2% of GNP. But the worst was yet to come.

- In 1985, interest on the national debt cost taxpayers $130 billion--almost three times the level of five years ago. This represents 3.8% of GNP, 13.5% of the entire 1985 budget, and a 1,450% increase in costs over 1965.

- $130 billion is equal to the sum total of all Federal spending from 1789--the founding of the republic--to 1936. It also equals total Federal outlays in 1966, the entire defense budget in 1980, and twice the level of medicare funding today.

But <u>if</u> we can adhere to the deficit-reduction goals we've set for ourselves, I am very, very optimistic about the course of the economy. I think we take too much for granted what we have achieved so far: strong growth <u>without</u> inflation. We can keep that going if we reduce the deficit substantially. The way is open to economic performance unprecedented in the postwar period if we have the will to find it.

May 14
Wed.
noon

Joyce

GREATER
Des Moines
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FEDERATION

April 9, 1986

Dole-
Kemp-confirmed
Biden-?
Hart-?
Gephardt-?

~~#45~~ 12:00 Lunch
betw. 12:30-1:00 speak
(approx 5-10 min)

The Honorable Robert Dole
U.S. Senate Majority Leader
S.H. 141
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Dole:

On Wednesday, May 14, 1986, (11:30 A.M. to 1:00 P.M.), at the Hyatt Regency Hotel, New Jersey Avenue, Washington, D.C., the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce Federation will host a luncheon for announced and potential 1988 Presidential Candidates in conjunction with the Federation's Annual Trip to Washington, D.C.

The Annual Washington, D.C. Trip is an opportunity for the Greater Des Moines Chamber of Commerce Federation to meet with members of the Iowa Congressional Delegation, Reagan Administrative Officials, members of Congress and Congressional Committee Staff.

The Federation would like to take this opportunity to meet the announced and potential candidates for President of the United States.

approx 75-100 attendees

The format for the luncheon will be very informal and will afford each candidate the opportunity to address approximately 100 key business leaders from the Greater Metropolitan area of Des Moines and central Iowa. There will be a brief question and answer period, however the main objective of the luncheon is to allow the candidates and the business leaders from central Iowa an opportunity to get acqainted.

(key interest: on sewage treatment approp under H.R. 8 - urge support of House bill)

We would greatly appreciate your interest in attending the luncheon by contacting Ronald N. Langston, Vice President of Governmental Affairs, 300 Saddlery Building, 309 Court Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50309. Mr. Langston may be contacted directly at (515) 286-4963.

used to be Grassley's L.A. or Char

interested in Sen. for '88

4/16 Copy to Don D.

We apologize for the extremely short notice about the luncheon. The Federation had originally scheduled the 1986 Annual Trip to Washington, D.C. in July. However, due to recent legislation such as Gramm Rudman, Hollins, the Tax Reform Act, and other critical issues which are now before the Congress, the Federation decided to move the Annual Trip to May.

Therefore, your interest and participation is greatly appreciated. We would be honored to visit with you, and should your schedule permit, look forward to meeting you personally Wednesday, May 14, 1986.

Sincerely,

Harlan Hockenberg, Chairman

Charles Wasker, Co-Chairperson Governmental Affairs

Lloyd Clarke, Co-Chairperson Governmental Affairs

P.S. An alternate luncheon date is Thursday, May 15, 1986.

cc: Kirk Culinkenbeard
c/o Campaign America
919 Prince Street
Suite 200
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

LYNDA L. NERSESIAN
ASSISTANT SECRETARY

United States Senate
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Attached is a list of participants in the Chamber of Commerce meeting. You will be seeing people wearing a lot of these buttons relating to the sewer issue that you will be questioned on.

PARTICIPANTS FOR WASHINGTON, D.C. TRIP
May 12, 1986

1. Jim Aipperspach
Northwestern Bell
909 High Street
Des Moines, IA 50309
286-5471

2. Leo Armatis
Meredith Corporation
1716 Locust
Des Moines, IA 50336
284-2878

3. Carrol D. Bolen
Pioneer Hi-Bred International
Capital Square
Des Moines, IA 50309
245-3591

4. James E. Bowman
Corinthian Gardens, Inc.
3608 Valdez Drive
Des Moines, IA 50310
284-7771

5. Roger Brooks
Central Life Assurance
611 5th Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50309
283-2371

6. John Burnquist
Des Moines Jaycees
Energy Policy Council
3523 University Apt. 3D
Des Moines, IA 50311

7. Perry Chapin
CIETC
112 11th Street, 4th Floor
Des Moines, IA 50309
286-3510

8. John Chrystal
Bankers Trust
7th & Locust
P.O. Box 897
Des Moines, IA 50304
245-2413

9. Lloyd Clarke
Clarke Companies
950 Office Park Road
West Des Moines, IA 50265
224-0000

10. Miriam Cline
Urbandale Council
3821 69th Street
Urbandale, IA 50322
276-2889

11. Connie Cook
Des Moines City Council
East First and Locust
Des Moines, IA 50307
274-3441

12. Jim S. Cownie
Heritage Communications
2195 Ingersoll Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50312
246-2264

13. Robert Cox
Firestone Tire & Rubber
P.O. Box 1295
Des Moines, IA 50305
243-1211

14. Johnny Danos
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.
2500 Ruan Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
288-7465

15. Gary Davidson
West Des Moines City Council
762 40th Street
West Des Moines, IA 50265
223-3250

* - Good G.O.P'S. - Should be open to the Pres. election - not committed that I know of.

16. Greg Dickinson
Merchants Warehouse
1350 W. Market
Des Moines, IA 50309
244-2123

17. John Patrick Dorrian
Des Moines City Council
East First and Locust
Des Moines, IA 50307
262-1555

18. Bill Hager
Hager Law Firm
500 Equitable Bldg.
Des Moines, IA 50309
246-1990

19. Merlin Hanson
McGladrey, Hendrickson & Pullen
640 Capital Square
Des Moines, IA 50309
284-8660

20. Harlan "Bud" Hockenberg
Davis, Hockenberg, Wine,
Brown & Koehn
2300 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
243-2300

21. Gloria Hoffmann
Des Moines School Board
4200 Leonard Place
Des Moines, IA 50310

22. G.M. Holdsworth
West Des Moines City Council
4940 West Park Drive
West Des Moines, IA 50265
223-3251

23. Jeff Hunter
Hotel Fort Des Moines
P.O. Box 7230
Des Moines, IA 50309
283-4141

24. Eldon Huston
Iowa Medical Society
1001 Grand
West Des Moines, IA 50265
223-1401

25. Lucille Johnson
Brenton Bank & Trust
3921 75th
Urbandale, IA 50322
278-6822

26. Joseph Jongewaard
1550 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
244-6837

27. Ric Jorgensen
Des Moines City Council
East First and Locust
Des Moines, IA 50307
247-5649

28. Sam Kalainov
American Mutual Life
418 6th Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50307
280-1331

29. Bill Keck
Parking, Inc.
401 Grand Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50309
244-5325

30. Glen Keppy
Iowa Pork Producers
R.R. 3, Box 6
Davenport, IA 52804
319-391-2075

31. C. John "Dutch" Kleywegt
DMACC
2006 S. Ankeny Blvd.
Ankeny, IA 50021
964-6474

32. Morris Knopf
Ahlers, Cooney, et al
300 Liberty Building
Des Moines, IA 50309
243-7611

33. Lee Kolmer
Dean of Agriculture
Iowa State University
Curtis Hall
Ames, IA 50011
294-2518

34. Mary Kramer
Blue Cross and Blue Shield
of Iowa
636 Grand
Des Moines, IA 50309
245-4500

35. Peter Kwett
Des Moines Renovation Co.
110 S.W. 5th
Des Moines, IA 50309
280-1952

36. Eleanore Levy
Eleanore A. Levy Real Estate
1200 35th Street, Suite 206
West Des Moines, IA 50265
225-2030

37. Anita Mandelbaum
Coopers & Lybrand
1700 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
282-9141

38. Dr. L.D. McMullen
Des Moines Water Works
2201 Valley Drive
Des Moines, IA 50321
283-8794

39. Carl Metzger
City of Ankeny
211 S.W. Walnut
Ankeny, IA 50021
964-5500

40. Wayne Moore, Vice Prsident
Development
Room 125
Beardshear Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011
294-5121

41. David Oman
Heritage Communications
2195 Ingersoll Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50312
246-2294

42. Curt Paddock
President's Office
Drake University
Des Moines, IA 50311
271-2191

43. Professor Daniel Powers
Drake University
2805 Brattleboro
Des Moines, IA
271-3800

44. Mary Riche
Riche Associates
1321 Walnut, Suite 200
Des Moines, IA 50309
282-6888

45. John Schacterle
Des Moines Jaycees
Hager Law Firm
2837 Kingman Blvd. Apt. 10
Des Moines, IA 50311

46. Ann Schodde
DMACC
2006 S. Ankeny Blvd.
Ankeny, IA 50021
964-6570

47. Paul H. Seltz
National Travelers Life
820 Keo Way
Des Moines, IA 50309
283-0101

48. Frank Severino
Health Policy Corporation
of Iowa
Two Ruan Center, Suite 330
Des Moines, IA 50309
244-1211

49. Anna Smith
Des Moines Renovation Co.
110 S.W. 5th
Des Moines, IA 50309
280-1952

50. Harold E. Smith
City Engineer
Des Moines City Hall
East First and Locust
Des Moines, IA 50307
283-4920

51. Jim Smith
Polk County Attorney
Polk County Court House
Room 408
Des Moines, IA 50309
286-3737

52. Thomas D. Smith
Bankers Trust Company
665 Locust
P.O. Box 897
Des Moines, IA 50304
245-5270

53. Gerald Snethen
Iowa Farm Bureau
5400 University
West Des Moines, IA 50265
225-5405

54. Steve Spade
MTA
1100 MTA Lane
Des Moines, IA 50309

55. Marilyn Staples
Des Moines Housing Council
3509 Caulder
Des Moines, IA 50321

56. Bob Sterling
MTA
1100 MTA Lane
Des Moines, IA 50309

57. Wayne Swegle
National Planning Assn.
309 Court Avenue
Des Moines, IA 50309
286-4961

58. Jack P. Taylor
Ringland-Johnson-Crowley
1603 22nd Street, Suite 200
West Des Moines, IA 50265
225-0123

59. Mark Templeton
Iowa Association of
Electric Cooperatives
8525 Douglas #48
Des Moines, IA 50322
276-5350

60. Keith Uhl
Scalise, Scism, Sandre
& Uhl
2910 Grand
Des Moines, IA 50312
282-2910

61. James Underwood
Iowa Comprehensive Manpower
Services, Inc.
1216 High Street
Des Moines, IA 50309
245-7800

62. Thomas N. Urban
Pioneer Hi-Bred International
Capital Square, Suite 700
400 Locust
Des Moines, IA 50309
245-3500

63. Daryl J. Vanderwilt
Director
DMACC
2006 S. Ankeny Blvd.
Ankeny, IA 50021
964-6554

64. Mayor Ollie Weigel
City of Ankeny
211 S.W. Walnut
Ankeny, IA 50021
964-5500

65. H. Mel Willits
Hospital Association of
Greater Des Moines
1980 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
243-8077

66. Jonathan Wilson
Davis Law Firm
2300 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
243-2300

67. Steve Zumbach
Belin, Harris Law Firm
2000 Financial Center
Des Moines, IA 50309
243-7100