## **Red Tape Review Rule Report**

(Due: September 1, 2025)

| Department | IEDA    | Date:       | 6/30/25                       | Total Rule  | Chapter  |
|------------|---------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Name:      |         |             |                               | Count:      | 213: 10  |
|            |         |             |                               |             | Chapter  |
|            |         |             |                               |             | 214: 3   |
|            | 261     | Chapter/    | Chapter # 213                 | Iowa Code   | 17A.9A   |
| IAC #:     |         | SubChapter/ | Chapter # 214                 | Section     | and      |
|            |         | Rule(s):    |                               | Authorizing | 15F.102; |
|            |         |             |                               | Rule:       | 15F.101  |
|            |         |             |                               |             | to       |
|            |         |             |                               |             | 15F.107  |
| 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 rules are intended to describe the Enhance Iowa Board, its members, its duties, and its authority.   |
| Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.  |
| No. Provisions creating the Enhance Iowa Board were repealed by 2024 Acts Ch. 1170 section 368.  |
| What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?   |
| None.  |
| What are the costs to the agency or any other agency to implement/enforce the rule?  |
| There is no cost to the agency for these rules because they are obsolete and no longer used.   |
| Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.  |
| Not applicable as there are no more costs.   |
| 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. |
| IEDA did not identify any less restrictive alternatives.   |
| 1  |

| D | Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| n | necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language? [list |  |  |  |
| C | chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]                                     |  |  |  |
|   | PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |
|   | Yes, the rules are obsolete and unnecessary.  |  |  |  |
| R | ULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):   |  |  |  |
|   | None.   |  |  |  |

| *RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION* (list rule number[s] or include text if available):       |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| None.  |  |  |
| *For rules being re-promulagted with changes, please attach a document with suggested changes. |  |  |

## **METRICS**

| Total number of rules repealed:   | 213: 10; 214: 3  |
|---|------------------|
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation                   | 213: 2,392; 214: |
|   | 455              |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 213: 27; 214: 7  |

| ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOM | MEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES? |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| No  |                                     |
| No.   |                                     |