

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

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--------------|
| Department Name: | Health and Human Services | Date: | April 16, 2025 | Total Rule Count: | 11 |
| IAC #: | 641 | Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s): | 77 | Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule: | 137 |
| 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?

This rule chapter defines the roles and responsibilities of local public health departments.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. There are 100 local public boards of health serving Iowans across the state. Local public health is provided in all 99 Iowa counties through 98 county boards of health, one city board of health (Dubuque), and one district board of health (Siouxland).

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

Local public boards of health may incur administrative costs to comply with this 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. There are 100 local public boards of health serving Iowans across the state. Local public health is provided in all 99 Iowa counties through 98 county boards of health, one city board of health (Dubuque), and one district board of health (Siouxland).

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 both required and appropriate.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

77.1 – deleted redundant purpose statement and renumbered
77.2 – deleted redundant department definition
77.4 – deleted minor, unneeded language
77.5 – deleted the rule as it is addressed in contract
77.6 – no change
77.7 – no change
77.8 – no change
77.9 – deleted references to the now defunct state board of public health and replaced them with “department”
77.10 – no change
77.11 - deleted references to the now defunct state board of public health and replaced them with “department”

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

77.1
77.5

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

77.2 - 4
77.6 - 11

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

METRICS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Total number of rules repealed: | 2 |
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 446 |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 12 |

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

No.