IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 9-332 / 88-1297

FILED
OCT 0 5 1989
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF EVERETT F. BUCK AND DIANA S. BUCK

Upon the Petition of

EVERETT F. BUCK,

Petitioner-Appellant,

And Concerning

DIANA S. BUCK,

Respondent-Appellee.

35

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County (CD 58-34641), Gene L. Needles, Judge.

Petitioner appeals the economic provisions of his dissolution decree. **AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED.**

Theodore F. Sporer, of Watson & Peterson, P.C., Des Moines, for the petitioner-appellant.

Lorna A. Gilbert, of Davis, Hockenberg, Wine, Brown, Koehn & Shors, Des Moines, for the respondent-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., and Sackett and Habhab, JJ.

SACKETT, J.

Petitioner-appellant Everett F. Buck challenges the economic provisions of his dissolution decree. We affirm as modified.

Everett and respondent-appellee Diana S. Buck were married in 1973. They have two children born in 1980 and 1982. Pursuant to an agreement between the parties, they assumed joint legal custody and Diana received physical care.

The economic issues were tried to court. The court awarded Diana $600 per month child support for two children and $400 a month for one. Additionally, Everett was ordered to carry health insurance on the two children. Everett was ordered to pay alimony of $200 per month for three years and pay $5,000 toward Diana's attorney fees The court allocated the parties' assets and liabilities between the parties.

Everett contends the child support, alimony and attorney fee awards were inequitable. He challenges the valuations established by the trial court and contends he should have a greater share of the property. We affirm as modified.

I.

Everett contends child support of $600 per month for two children and $400 per month for one child, plus health insurance, is excessive. The parties' Iowa tax return

filed as married, filing separately, for 1987 shows Everett had net income of $20,387 and Diana had income of $16,572. We affirm the child support award.

II.

Everett contends he should not be required to pay alimony. Everett had a college degree when the parties were married. Diana had one year of college. She has obtained some additional education during the marriage. Both parties have been employed outside the home during most of the marriage and have made FICA contributions which will accrue to their benefits. Diana is the beneficiary of a trust that will provide assistance should she seek additional education. The parties both received substantial property interests. Neither leaves the marriage at an economic disadvantage. We modify the award to eliminate the alimony award. See In re Marriage of Griffin, 356 N.W.2d 606, 609 (Iowa App. 1984); In re Marriage of Stewart, 356 N.W.2d 611, 613 (Iowa App. 1984).

We look at the same factors and modify the order requiring Everett to pay $5,000 of Diana's attorney fees. We modify the order to reduce the attorney fee award to $2,500.

Everett challenges the valuation placed on the assets by the trial court. Everett also challenges the property award. He points to certain gifts and concessions from his family and contends the ultimate division is inequitable.

We consider the financial provisions together. See In re Marriage of Dahl, 418 N.W.2d 358, 359 (Iowa App. 1987). We affirm the property award.

Appellate costs are taxed one-half to each party.

AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED.