

Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2026)

Department Name:	Health and Human Services (HHS)	Date:	4/5/24	Total Rule Count:	15
IAC #:	441	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	109	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	237A
Contact Name:	Jordan McTaggart	Email:	jmctagg@dhs.state.ia.us	Phone:	515-829-1095

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

This chapter assigns the minimum health, safety, and training requirements for licensed child care centers. This chapter aligns federal and state regulation with practical application of health and safety. HHS licensing and regulatory staff utilize this chapter to inspect child care facilities and hold accountable to minimum standards. Standards are aligned to checklist and inspection reports.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

The benefit of ensuring there was no duplication in rules and making the rule chapter less cumbersome with improved readability. Meetings were held with child care center directors to ensure their needs were met and there was no burdensome rules impacting their ability to provide care for the children.

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

Minimal regulatory fees are assessed to centers based on center capacity. Other minor costs such as cost to maintain training certifications.

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

HHS incurs personnel costs for team members to execute the program.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

There are no additional costs beyond what is in place

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.

HHS supports child care center regulations in accordance with Iowa Code, federal regulations and as required to protect the health and safety of children, and staff.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

441-109.1
441-109.2
441-109.3
441-109.4
441-109.5
441-109.6
441-109.7
441-109.9
441-109.10
441-109.12
441-109.14
441-109.15

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

Not applicable.

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

441-109.1
441-109.2
441-109.3
441-109.4
441-109.5
441-109.6
441-109.7
441-109.8
441-109.9
441-109.10
441-109.11
441-109.12
441-109.13
441-109.14
441-109.15
441-109.16

***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	6,008
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	131

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

--