# Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 2024)

| Department<br>Name: | Health and<br>Human<br>Services | Date:                               | September 1, 2024            | Total Rule<br>Count:                         | 5  |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|
| IAC #:              | 641                             | Chapter/<br>SubChapter/<br>Rule(s): | 75                           | Iowa Code<br>Section<br>Authorizing<br>Rule: | 88GA,<br>ch85,<br>section 98<br>and 90GA,<br>ch 19,<br>section 346 |
| Contact<br>Name:    | Victoria L.<br>Daniels          | Email:                              | compliancerules@hhs.iowa.gov | Phone:                                       | 515-829-<br>6021   |

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

| What i | ic tha               | intende      | d henefit   | of the | rula? |
|--------|----------------------|--------------|-------------|--------|-------|
| wilai  | I <b>~</b> I I I I I | 1111 6111116 | 1 110110111 | ()   I | 11110 |

| To help ensure that none of the awarded lowa HHS T | itle X federally | funded agencies a | are providing or | indirectly |
|--|------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------|
| supporting abortion services.                      |                  |                   |                  |            |

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. All Iowa HHS Title X agencies provide attestations that they will not provide abortions and/or indirectly support abortion as a method of family planning services.

| 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? |  |  |  |  |

Administrative

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

N/A

Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit?  $\square$  YES  $\boxtimes$  NO If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.

88GA, ch85, section 98, and 90GA, ch 19, section 346 require the Department to promulgate rules.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Title – the title was revised to reflect the resultant structure after revision.

75.1 – eliminated as duplicative of federal manual, program handbooks, and other department rules.

75.2 - eliminated a redundant reference to the Department and revised one definition to cite back to 88GA, ch85, Section 98.

75.3 restructured and updated reference back to U.S. Code.

75.4-5 – eliminated as duplicative of federal manual, program handbooks, and other department rules.

| <b>RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL</b> | (list rule number[s | s]): |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------|
|----------------------------------|---------------------|------|

75.1

75.4 - 5

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

**New Title** 

75.2

75.3

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

#### **METRICS**

| Total number of rules repealed:   | 3     |
|---|-------|
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation                   | 4,919 |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 11    |

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