

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

Department Name:	Health and Human Services	Date:	5.13.24	Total Rule Count:	28
IAC #:	441	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	47	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	239B.4(6)
Contact Name:	Jordan McTaggart	Email:	jmctagg@dhs.state.ia.us	Phone:	515-829-1095

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The purpose of the family self sufficiency grant (FSSG) program is to provide immediate and short-term assistance to PROMISE JOBS participant families, which will remove barriers related to obtaining or retaining employment.

This chapter was previously Division 2 only of 441-47 (Division 1 has been restructured into 441-48)

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

SFY23, FSSG made 1554 payments to 812 families and the total expended was \$570,285.17.

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

None identified.

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

HHS and IWD incur personnel costs for team members to implement the program. This program is funded by TANF block grant. FSSG issued 49.1% of what was allotted in SFY23. Total payment limit language was updated from “family” to “FIA-responsible person”, to allow for greater utilization of this opportunity. This change is exclusively within the limits, and is still defined by, Iowa Code.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Families participating in PROMISE JOBS would be less successful without access to the flexible funding that FSSG can provide to them. The goal of the FSSG program is to reduce the length of time a family is dependent on the family investment program.

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.

Without this chapter there would be no way to implement the FSSG program and leave appeal rights intact for participants.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

441-47.1
441-47.2
441-47.21
441-47.22
441-47.23
441-47.24
441-47.25
441-47.26
441-47.27

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

44-47.3
44-47.4
44-47.5
44-47.6
44-47.7
44-47.8
44-47.9
44-47.10
44-47.11
44-47.12
44-47.13
44-47.14
44-47.15
44-47.16
44-47.17
44-47.18
44-47.19
44-47.20

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

441-47.1 - (re-promulgated as 441-48.2)
441-47.2 - (re-promulgated as 441-48.3)
441-47.21
441-47.22
441-47.23
441-47.24
441-47.25
441-47.26
441-47.27
441-47.28

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	17
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	683
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	26

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