

Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2025)

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Department Name: | Health and Human Services | Date: | May 1, 2025 | Total Rule Count: | 22 |
| IAC #: | 641 | Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s): | 3 | Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule: | 135.131 |
| Contact Name: | Victoria L. Daniels | Email: | Victoria.daniels@hhs.iowa.gov | Phone: | 515-829-6021 |

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

641—Chapter 3 implements Iowa’s Early Hearing Detection and Intervention program (EHDI), which provides for universal hearing screening for all newborns and infants in Iowa. The goal of the program is early detection of hearing loss to allow children and their families the earliest possible opportunity to obtain appropriate early intervention services.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. Hearing loss is the most frequently occurring birth defect. Approximately 2-3 per 1,000 babies born in US have some level of hearing difference. Another 3 per 1,000 will develop hearing differences in early childhood (late onset). Without early intervention, children with hearing differences are at risk of falling behind typically-hearing peers in language, social-emotional, and academic skills.

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

Health care providers may incur administrative costs to comply with the reporting requirements of the rule chapter.

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

The Department incurs personnel and other administrative costs to implement the rule chapter.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. Hearing loss is the most frequently occurring birth defect. Approximately 2-3 per 1,000 babies born in US have some level of hearing difference. Another 3 per 1,000 will develop hearing differences in early childhood (late onset). Without early intervention, children with hearing differences are at risk of falling behind typically-hearing peers in language, social-emotional, and academic skills.

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.

Iowa Code section 135.131 requires the Department to promulgate administrative 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

3.1 – eliminated redundant and duplicative definitions
3.2 – eliminated as being redundant and renumbered
3.3 – eliminated as being redundant and renumbered
3.4 – no change
3.5 – no change
3.6 – no change
3.7 – no change
3.8 – referred back to the applicable Iowa Code section
3.9 – no change
3.10 – eliminated specific website address
3.11 – removed reference to an inapplicable Code citation
3.12 – eliminated a restrictive term
3.13 – no change
3.14 – no change
3.15 through 3.22 – eliminated as having no underlying statutory authority for administrative rules

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

3.2, 3.3, 3.15 through 3.22

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

3.1, 3.4 through 3.14

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

METRICS

| | |
|---|-------|
| Total number of rules repealed: | 10 |
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 2,200 |
| 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.