

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

Department Name:	Health and Human Services	Date:	9/1/2026	Total Rule Count:	11
IAC #:	441	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	177	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	249A.3(2)
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?

The purpose of this proposed rulemaking is to describe the In-home Health-related Care program (IHHRC), which is designed to provide in-home nursing care to an individual whose physical, developmental, or mental health prevents independent self-care. The provider, who is usually a relative, is certified by a physician and the program dollars are optimized by not paying a higher rate charged by an agency.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. In SFY25, there was a monthly average of 184 individuals served under the program. Expenditures under the program averaged \$85,223 per month, with a total of \$1,022,676 expended.

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

There are no costs incurred by the public to comply with the 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. In SFY25, there was a monthly average of 184 individuals served under the program. Expenditures under the program averaged \$85,223 per month, with a total of \$1,022,676 expended.

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.

Rulemaking is required by Iowa Code section 249A.3(2).

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

- Redundant language was deleted in the opening statement, definitions, and subrule 177.2.
- Acronyms were standardized.
- The use of form numbers was eliminated.
- Restrictive terms were eliminated.
- Irrelevant paragraphs were deleted in subrule 117.8(3).

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

177.1

177.3

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

177.2

177.4 through 177.10

****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	791
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	19

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

No.