

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

Department Name:	Human Services	Date:	5/15/26	Total Rule Count:	9
IAC #:	441	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	170	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	237A.13 and 237A.29.
Contact Name:	Joe Campos	Email:	Joe.campos@hhs.iowa.gov	Phone:	

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

This chapter establishes requirements for the payment of child care services. Child care services are for children of low-income parents who are in academic or vocational training, or employed or looking for employment, or unable to care for children due to physical or mental illness, or needing protective services to prevent or alleviate child abuse or neglect. Services may be provided in a licensed child care center, a registered child development home, the child's own home, or a nonregistered family child care home.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

There are currently 1,336 licensed child care centers, 1,1726 non-registered child development homes, and 89 non-registered child care homes with a Child Care Assistance agreement. For the month of December 2025, 19,301 children were served through this program, and 11,184 families utilized child care assistance funds. During the 2025 Federal Fiscal Year, the total Child Care Development Fund appropriation was \$109,630,285.

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

There are no costs associated with this rulemaking.

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

There are no other implementation or enforcement costs aside from personnel expenses.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes, and the establishment of these rules is required by Iowa Code sections 237A.13 and 237A.29.

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.

No. The establishment of these rules is the less restrictive option, and is required by Iowa Code sections

237A.13 and 237A.29.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

170.8 and 170.9

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

170.1 through 170.7

****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	OG WC: 13,166
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	OG RT: 208

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

No.