

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

|                         |                      |                                      |                                                                      |                                            |        |
|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------|--------|
| <b>Department Name:</b> | Child Advocacy Board | <b>Date:</b>                         | 5/15/26                                                              | <b>Total Rule Count:</b>                   | 6      |
| <b>IAC #:</b>           | 489                  | <b>Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):</b> | 4                                                                    | <b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b> | 237.18 |
| <b>Contact Name:</b>    | Joe Campos           | <b>Email:</b>                        | <a href="mailto:Joe.campos@hhs.iowa.gov">Joe.campos@hhs.iowa.gov</a> | <b>Phone:</b>                              |        |

**PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE**

### What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The child advocacy board is required by Iowa Code section 237.18 to establish procedures and protocols for administering the court appointed special advocate program.

### Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. In SFY25, local boards reviewed and reported to the state board on 795 reviews, held for 531 cases involving 839 different children.

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

This rulemaking does not have a cost to the public.

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

The Department incurs personnel and other administrative costs associated with implementation of this chapter.

### Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. The child advocacy board is required to establish procedures and protocols for administering the court appointed special advocate program.

### 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.

Yes. As a result of the Red Tape Review outlined by Executive Order 10, this chapter is being rescinded, and the content compiled into 489—Chapter 1.

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**

No.

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

489—3.1 through 3.6

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

N/A

***\*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                   | 1,705 |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 22    |

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

No.