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

Department Name:	Health and Human Services (HHS)	**Date:**	4/12/2024	**Total Rule Count:**	26
IAC #:	641	**Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):**	73	**Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:**	234.6(1)f
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 WIC Program must follow USDA Federal Regulations. States do have some flexibility in how some of the Federal Regulations are implemented, therefore, the Iowa Administrative Code can provide more Iowa specific practices, however the USDA Federal Regulations would take precedence.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

The Iowa WIC Program serves approximately 62,000 participants. There are approximately 550 approved WIC vendors in Iowa. The WIC Iowa Administrative Code has been helpful in situation such as violations and appeals.

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 incurs personnel costs for team members to execute the program.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. These rules provide structure and consistency for contractors, and over 60,000 Iowans participating in the WIC 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.

Alternatives, such as the sole reference point being a state plan may cause inconsistencies or lack of clarity. In addition, this chapter clarifies federal regulations, and establishes a legal basis for Iowa's administrative options.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

641-73.1
641-73.2
641-73.3
641-73.4
641-73.5
641-73.6
641-73.7
641-73.8
641-73.9
641-73.10
641-73.11
641-73.12
641-73.13
641-73.14
641-73.15
641-73.16
641-73.17
641-73.18
641-73.19
641-73.20
641-73.21
641-73.22
641-73.23
641-73.24
641-73.25
641-73.26

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

641-73.2
641-73.3
641-73.5
641-73.8
641-73.10
641-73.15
641-73.17

641-73.18
641-73.20
641-73.21
641-73.22
641-73.23
641-73.24
641-73.25
641-73.26

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

641-73.1 (re-promulgated as 441-67.2)
641-73.4 (re-promulgated as 441-67.1)
641-73.6 (re-promulgated as 441-67.3)
641-73.7 (re-promulgated as 441-67.4)
641-73.9 (re-promulgated as 441-67.5)
641-73.11 (re-promulgated as 441-67.7)
641-73.12 (re-promulgated as 441-67.6)
641-73.13 (re-promulgated as 441-67.8)
641-73.14 (re-promulgated as 441-67.9)
641-73.16 (re-promulgated as 441-67.10)
641-73.19 (re-promulgated as 441-67.11)

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	15
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	12,983
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	257

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