# Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2025)

| Department | lowa        | Date:       |                           | Total Rule  |              |  |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------------|-------------|--------------|--|
| Name:      | Workforce   |             | May 20, 2025              | Count:      | 13           |  |
|            | Development |             |                           |             |              |  |
|            |             | Chapter/    |                           | Iowa Code   |              |  |
| IAC #:     | 871         | SubChapter/ | 69                        | Section     | 15.411       |  |
|            |             | Rule(s):    |                           | Authorizing |              |  |
|            |             |             |                           | Rule:       |              |  |
| Contact    | Dane        | Email:      | Dane.Hopwood@iwd.iowa.gov | Phone:      | 515-672-4200 |  |
| Name:      | Hopwood     |             |                           |             |              |  |

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

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

This rule chapter is intended to clarify the requirements of utilizing the funding of and administering Iowa's Innovative Businesses Internship program.

# Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes, each year many lowa businesses apply for the Innovative Businesses Internship program utilizing these rules. In FY24, 57 Iowa businesses applied for 136 internships.

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

NA, no impact on funding with proposed changes.

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

NA, no impact on funding with proposed changes.

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

NA, there are no costs other than costs associated with IWD's time completing the red tape review.

# Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit? $\Box$ YES $\boxtimes$ NO If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.

No less costly or intrusive methods exist.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Yes, this language has been removed from the below rules 69.3(15), 69.8(15)- Outdated 69.4(1-4), 69.5 (15), 69.5(1-4),69.7(15), 69.9(1-2), 69.10(1-4), 69.11(15), 69.12(15), 69.12(1-2, 5-8),69.13(2-3)- Unnecessary Language

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

69.1-13

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

69.1-13

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

#### METRICS

| Total number of rules repealed:                                     | 13 |
|---|----|
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation   | 7  |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or | 26 |
| re-promulgation   |    |

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

No