

Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 2025)

Department Name:	Health and Human Services	Date:	June 1, 2025	Total Rule Count:	9
IAC #:	641	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	56	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	135.22B
Contact Name:	Victoria L. Daniels	Email:	Victoria.daniels@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-829-6021

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The overall purpose of this chapter is to establish administrative rules in accordance with Iowa Code section 135.22B relative to the financial eligibility requirements for services under the waiver-eligible and cost-share components of the brain injury services program. However, these components have not been funded for many years.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

No. Because the components that are the subject of the rules continue not to be funded, there is no benefit to having procedures in the administrative rules. The rule chapter exists to comply with the Department's rulemaking requirements as described in 135.22B.

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

No costs are incurred by the public to comply with this rule chapter.

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

Because the components described in this rule chapter continue to not be funded, the Department does not incur any costs to implement this rule chapter.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

This question is not applicable. There are no costs associated with these rules and no particular benefit other than complying with rulemaking responsibilities required by law.

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.

Rulemaking is required by law.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

56.1 – deleted redundant definitions, introduced a shortened term and updated outdated terminology
56.2 – deleted purpose statement as being redundant and renumbered
56.3 – added a date certain
56.4 – minor rewording; deleted a restrictive term
56.5 – deleted a redundant subrules and redundant language; deleted restrictive terms
56.6 – deleted restrictive terms
56.7 – deleted redundant language and restrictive terms
56.8 – minor rewording and deleted restrictive terms
56.9 – updated appeals process to comply with the department’s standard under 441—Chapter 7

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

56.2

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

56.1, 56.3 through 9

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	1
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	209
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	9

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

Because the components described in these rules are not funded and have not been funded for many years, it may be appropriate to amend 135.22B to repeal the Department’s rulemaking requirements.