

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

Department Name:	Public Health	Date:	September 1, 2024	Total Rule Count:	3
IAC #:	641	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	134	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	147A.27
Contact Name:	Victoria L. Daniels	Email:	compliancerules@hhs.iowa.gov	Phone:	NA

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

To help ensure all Iowa hospitals are verified to be equipped with the appropriate resources to provide trauma services and optimal care for injured patients. To adopt published national guidelines with required criteria/standards for hospitals to be verified trauma centers. To outline the process, timeline, and disciplinary process.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

The state trauma program maintains verification for all hospitals in the state of Iowa. There are currently, 2 Level 1 adult trauma care facilities, 1 Level 1 pediatric trauma care facility, 2 Level 2 Adult trauma care facilities, 1 Level 2 pediatric trauma care facility, 13 level 3 trauma care facilities and 100 level 4 trauma care facilities.

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

The cost to the public to maintain trauma care facility verification is dependent upon the level of verification. In general, Level 1 trauma care facilities have a robust trauma program in place that supports a multidisciplinary team. As you move towards level 4 verification status the work may be distributed between 1-2 staff members and can be maintained as other duties as assigned.

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

Personnel and other administrative costs.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. Iowa has a proud tradition of a robust trauma system since the late 1990s. We are considered a leader in trauma system development across the nation. It is a strength for Iowa that every hospital, no matter where it is located is prepared to care for injured patients. Other states model their laws and rules off of Iowa's.

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.

Rules are appropriate and required to enforce the underlying laws and protect the public.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

134.1 – eliminated restrictive term and definitions that were duplicative of statutory language

134.2 – revised as follows:

- Added one reference to statute
- Updated department name pursuant to alignment
- Updated reference names and dates
- Simplified language
- Standardized use of acronyms
- Deleted redundant information
- Eliminated restrictive terms
- Eliminated disciplinary actions
- Removed outdated and unnecessary provisions

134.3 – revised as follows:

- Eliminated language duplicative of statute
- Eliminated Department address and bureau reference
- Eliminated restrictive terms

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

None, but several subrules.

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

134.1 - 134.3

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	0
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	2,009
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	42

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

