# Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 20 25 )	(Due:	Septem	ber 1,	20 25 )
----------------------------	-------	--------	--------	---------

Department	IFA	Date:	4/29/25	Total Rule	7
Name:				Count:	
	265	Chapter/	Chapter 33	Iowa Code	Section
IAC #:		SubChapter/		Section	16.5(1)
		Rule(s):		Authorizing	"r";
				Rule:	Section
					16.131;
					2009 Iowa
					Acts,
					Senate
					File 376,
					section
					13(4)
Contact	Tyler	Email:	Tyler.barnard@iowafinance.com	Phone:	515-452-
Name:	Barnard				0418

#### PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

#### What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The intended benefit of Chapter 33 is to provide financial assistance to communities for water quality and wastewater improvement projects.

#### Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

The benefit is no longer being achieved, because the appropriation made pursuant to 2009 Iowa Acts, Senate File 376, section 13(4), to fund this program has been expended. The agency continues to administer other programs that support water quality pursuant to Iowa Code chapter 16, subchapter X, parts 2 and 4. The grants provided pursuant to 2009 Iowa Acts, Senate File 376, section 13(4) were intended to supplement the statutory programs only to the extent of the appropriation.

#### What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?

N/A.

### What are the costs to the agency or any other agency to implement/enforce the rule?

There is no cost to the agency for this rule because it is obsolete and no longer used.

#### Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Not applicable as there are no more costs.

Ave these less restrictive altermetives to accomplish the honefit?
Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit?   YES   NO
If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other
states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.
IFA did not identify any less restrictive alternatives.
Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or
un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory
language? [list chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]
PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE
Yes. The chapter is unnecessary.
Too. The chapter is anniocedary.
RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):
265.33.1
265.33.2
265.33.3
265.33.4
265.33.5
265.33.6
265.33.7
RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):
RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):
RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):  None.
None.

## **METRICS**

Total number of rules repealed:	7
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	1,185
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-	20
promulgation	

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?
No.