FILED
JUN 28 1979
CLERK SUPREME COURT

182

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE MARRIAGE OF KAREN ANNE HATFIELD AND DONALD ROBERT HATFIELD

Upon the Petition of)
KAREN ANNE HATFIELD,) Filed June 28, 1979
Petitioner-Appellee,)
and Concerning)
DONALD ROBERT HATFIELD,) 146 / 2-61650
Respondent-Appellant.)

Appeal from Scott District Court - Nathan Grant, Judge.

Husband appeals property and support provisions of dissolution decree. - Affirmed as Modified.

Alan R. Havercamp, of Havercamp, Havercamp & Murray, Davenport, for Respondent - Appellant.

Harold J. DeLange II, of Wehr & DeLange, Davenport, for Petitioner - Appellee.

Submitted to Oxberger, C.J., and Donielson, Snell, Carter and Johnson, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Respondent Donald Hatfield appeals the property and support provisions of trial court's decree dissolving his marriage to petitioner Karen Hatfield. We affirm with modification.

The parties were first married in 1965, divorced in 1971, and remarried each other in 1972. At the time of trial, Donald was 35 years old, Karen was 31, and the couple's two children were ages six and eleven. Donald has been continuously employed by United Parcel Service with a gross monthly income of $1650. Although Karen has occasionally worked outside of the home, she suffers from a chronic intestinal disorder known as Crohn's disease for which she has undergone five operations in the last four years. She receives $177 per month in Supplemental Social Security Income.

Our review of the case is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. The only substantial asset of the parties is their homestead valued at $45,000 with an incumbrance of approximately $22,000. Karen was awarded possession of the home until the youngest child reaches 18, marries, or becomes self-supporting, at which time the residence will be sold and Donald will be paid one half of the present equity or $11,500. We affirm this portion of the court's decree in light of the fact that Karen has custody of the children and will be required to make a home for them and because she will be responsible for making the monthly payments on the property. See In re Marriage of Moorehead, 224 N.W.2d 242, 245 (Iowa 1974).

Trial court also ordered Donald to pay child support of $75 per week per child and $15 per week alimony, with the alimony obligation to increase to $150 weekly once the child support payments terminate. Donald contends these awards are excessive. We find the following language from In re Marriage of Florke, 270 N.W.2d 643 at 645 (Iowa 1978), applicable hereto:

> Petitioner argues that the support burdens imposed upon him by the decree create an unreasonable hardship. His predicament, however, is not unique. Often in marriage dissolutions, incomes that were adequate to support married couples and their children are stretched precariously thin in order to cover the expenses of maintaining two households. Such is the condition presented by this case.

Karen's monthly expenses for herself and the children are approximately $1000, yet her social security income and the support provisions of the decree yield only $826 per month. On the other hand, after Donald deducts the support obligations from his

monthly take-home pay, he retains only $483 per month which is $150 less than his estimated personal living expenses. In addition, Donald was ordered to pay the couple's outstanding debts of approximately $3984. Under the circumstances of the case, we find that the child support payments should be reduced to $60 per week per child and that Karen's alimony should terminate upon her remarriage or the death of either party. Except for these changes, all other terms of the decree are affirmed. We think the record fully supports trial court's finding that Karen has little or no prospect of becoming gainfully employed.

We have considered Karen's application for appellate attorney fees and order Donald to pay $750 toward those fees. See Youel v. Youel, 218 N.W.2d 449, 452 (Iowa 1974). Costs are taxed to Donald.

AFFIRMED AS MODIFIED.