FILED
SEP 28 1988
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE MARRIAGE OF BEVERLY SUE WIELAND
AND DANIEL MICHAEL WIELAND

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Upon the Petition of **BEVERLY SUE WIELAND,** | ) | |
| Petitioner-Appellee, | ) | 470 |
| And Concerning **DANIEL MICHAEL WIELAND,** | ) | 8-370 / 87-1445 |
| Respondent-Appellant. | ) | |

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Marshall County (No. D4266) - Carl D. Baker, Judge.

Respondent husband appeals from the decree dissolving the parties' marriage. **AFFIRMED.**

Sharon Soorholtz Greer, of Cartwright, Druker & Ryden, Marshalltown, for appellant.

Barry S. Kaplan, of Fairall, Fairall, Kaplan & Hoglan, Marshalltown, for appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., and Donielson and Schlegel, JJ.

**PER CURIAM**

171

This appeal is from the dissolution of a marriage of seventeen and a half years. The dissolution was heard in June 1987. Respondent husband contends: (1) that the property division was inequitable; and (2) the district court should have established a specific visitation schedule rather than merely allowing him "reasonable visitation" with the parties' daughter.

There were two children born of this marriage only one of whom, Carrie, born in 1973, is still a minor. Carrie is mentally retarded.

In 1967, Daniel started work for the Packaging Corporation of America. He lost his job in May 1981. He has worked as a carpenter since that time. While working for Packaging Corporation Daniel earned a salary of approximately $24,000. Daniel has fixed monthly expenses of $800.

Beverly recently completed her education in nursing. She is currently employed as an L.P.N. at the Iowa Veterans Home. Beverly's salary in 1986 was $17,136. Beverly has $1,000 as her monthly expenses.

The trial court ordered the parties' home sold and the net proceeds divided equally. Beverly was to be credited for mortgage payments which Daniel failed to make pursuant to the temporary order. Daniel was awarded the truck with an approximate value of $300. Beverly was awarded the car

with a net value of $4,000. Each party was awarded a portion of personal property, Daniel's award valued at $8,029 and Beverly's award valued at $7,514.

Through his employment at Packaging Corporation Daniel had accumulated a retirement profit sharing account of almost $21,000. Much of this money was used to pay family debts and for Daniel's living expenses. The remaining amount of $9,000 was placed in a certificate of deposit which was used as collateral for several loans. The trial court ordered the certificates of deposit be cashed and the proceeds be divided equally after payment of the loans for which it had been used as collateral.

The district court further directed each party to pay the debts he or she had assumed sole responsibility for in pretrial conference statements. Beverly has been sued by Sears in Small Claims Court. The parties were ordered jointly responsible for any resulting judgment.

Our review is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. After considering and balancing all of the relevant factors enumerated in section 598.21 of the Iowa Code, we affirm the property division ordered by the trial court.

Daniel contends that he was awarded twenty-six percent (26%) of the marital assets as compared to Beverly's seventy-four percent (74%). We find Daniel's computation to be incorrect on two counts. First, Daniel characterizes the house-related liabilities as incorrectly assessed to

him in total. However, Daniel was ordered to pay the house payment by way of temporary support and was four months in arrears at the time of trial. We conclude that these responsibilities should remain with Daniel. The trial court properly ordered that Beverly be credited for mortgage payments which Daniel failed to make. Secondly, Daniel includes Beverly's IPERS account as a marital assets. Beverly's IPERS account amounts to $1,601 which has been accumulated over a three and one-half year period. We find this amount to be insignificant. Further, we find that Daniel miscalculated the value of Beverly's automobile by $1,000. Given these corrections, we find roughly a 60/40 breakdown in Beverly's favor. It is well established that equality need not be achieved with mathematical exactness. In re Marriage of Bornstein, 359 N.W.2d 500, 503 (Iowa App. 1984); In re Marriage of Conley, 284 N.W.2d 220, 223 (Iowa 1979).

Daniel also appeals the provisions of the visitation schedule ordered by the trial court. The district court set up a joint custody arrangement with Beverly having physical care of Carrie. Daniel specifically contends the district court should have established a specific visitation schedule rather than ordering "reasonable visitation." Daniel has regularly exercised his visitation rights and the record does not reveal any complications or

problems between the parties under the current arrangement. Therefore we find no need to change the parties' visitation schedule.

Daniel also asserts that he may have need to relocate in the future. We find that arranging for visitation to accommodate such a situation is premature at this time.

Costs of appeal are taxed to Daniel.

**AFFIRMED.**