

Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2024)

Department Name:	IFA	Date:	4/1/24	Total Rule Count:	7
IAC #:	265	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	Chapter 23	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	Section 16.48
Contact Name:	Lisa Connell	Email:	Lisa.connell@iowaeda.com	Phone:	(515) 348-6163

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The intended benefit of chapter 23 is to describe eligibility requirements and administration of the transitional housing revolving loan program fund (fund). The fund assisted in the development of affordable housing for parents completing or participating in substance abuse treatment pursuant to Iowa Code section 16.48. The authority issued two loans from the fund on December 19, 2006 and October 10, 2007. The two outstanding loans will mature on December 19, 2026 and November 1, 2037, respectively.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

No. There has been no further interest from investors to obtain loans and the rules do not address any requirements applicable to existing loans after loan funds have been disbursed. The on-going obligations of loan recipients are instead addressed in a comprehensive loan agreement. The requirements of the program are sufficiently described in section 16.48 if there is interest in the future and the section does not require the authority to promulgate rules.

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?

Although repayment is not addressed in the rules, IFA staff time is required to continue collecting payments for two outstanding loans.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Not applicable.

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.

Not applicable.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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 as a whole is unnecessary.

RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):

265.23.1
265.23.2
265.23.3
265.23.4
265.23.5
265.23.6
265.23.7

***RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION* (list rule number[s] or include text if available):**

None.

****For rules being re-promulgated with changes, you may attach a document with suggested changes.***

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	7
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	1137
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	24

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?

No.