

## Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 20 24 )

<b>Department Name:</b>	Iowa Workforce Development	<b>Date:</b>	6.3.2024	<b>Total Rule Count:</b>	17
<b>IAC #:</b>	871	<b>Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):</b>	25	<b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b>	96 and 421.17(26,29).
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Jeffrey Koncsol	<b>Email:</b>	Jeffrey.koncsol@iwd.iowa.gov	<b>Phone:</b>	515-725-5400

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

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

The rules found under “Benefit Payment Control” allows Unemployment Insurance Services Division of Iowa Workforce Development guidance on investigating and preventing unemployment benefits paid through error by the agency or through willful misrepresentation or error. It also allows for penalization for fraudulent actions.

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

Yes, the Unemployment Insurance Services Division actively investigates and prevents fraudulent activity regarding unemployment benefits.

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

The Unemployment Insurance Services Division of Iowa Workforce Development utilizes team members to investigate and pursue fraudulent activities.

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

Iowa Workforce Development employs a team to investigate and pursue fraudulent activities.

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

Yes. Both federal and state legislation desires pursues fraudulent unemployment benefit activities.

**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.**

Benefit Payment Control activities have served a valuable resource in the prevention and pursuit of fraudulent unemployment benefit activities. At this time, there is no legislative initiative to change the rules.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

871.25.1; 871.25.2; 871.25.3; 871.25.4; 871.25.5; 871.25.6; 871.25.7; 871.25.8; 871.25.9; 871.25.10; 871.25.11; 871.25.12; 871.25.13; 871.25.14; 871.25.15; 871.25.16; 871.25.17

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

871.25.1; 871.25.2; 871.25.3; 871.25.4; 871.25.5; 871.25.6; 871.25.7; 871.25.8; 871.25.9; 871.25.10; 871.25.11; 871.25.12; 871.25.13; 871.25.14; 871.25.15; 871.25.16; 871.25.17

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

871.25.1; 871.25.2; 871.25.3; 871.25.4; 871.25.5; 871.25.6; 871.25.7; 871.25.8; 871.25.9; 871.25.10; 871.25.11; 871.25.12; 871.25.13; 871.25.14; 871.25.15; 871.25.16; 871.25.17

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

#### METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	17
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	2,294
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	57

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

Not applicable.