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

Department Name:	Department of Health and Human Services	**Date:**	September 1, 2025	**Total Rule Count:**	6
IAC #:	641	**Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):**	141	**Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:**	147A.4
Contact Name:	Joe Campos	**Email:**	compliancerules@hhs.iowa.gov	**Phone:**	515-304-0963

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The purpose of the Love our Kids Grant is to provide funding to statewide, regional and local agencies and service programs that serve to promote the development, promotion, and implementation of injury prevention and education for children in Iowa. Funds are provided by the Iowa Department of Transportation and the Department disburses to eligible agencies across the state.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Iowa Code does not dictate that the funds must be administered via grants. In addition, there is no rulemaking authority for this chapter. Therefore, the Department is proposing to rescind this chapter, and distribute funds to agencies through the procurement and contracting process instead of through grants.

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

None beyond what is stipulated in Iowa Code.

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

None beyond what is stipulated in Iowa Code.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Distribution of funds through contracts instead of grants will allow for the funds to be disbursed in a more efficient manner, allowing for a greater impact to local communities utilizing these funds.

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.

Moving away from funding via grants will allow the required funds to be disbursed in a more efficient manner.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

The chapter is set to be rescinded.

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

641—Chapter 141

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

Not applicable.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	**6**
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	**516**
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	**8**

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

No.