

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

Department Name:	IWD	Date:	July 2, 2024	Total Rule Count:	13
IAC #:	871	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	64	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	260F
Contact Name:	Rebecca Stonawski	Email:	rebecca.stonawski@iwd.iowa.gov	Phone:	515-868-1939

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

To explain the holding and transfer of 260F workforce development funds.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. Both IWD and IDR understand the holding and transfer of 260F workforce development funds.

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

None.

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

None.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

NA

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.

This chapter explains how 260F workforce development funds are transferred between IDR and IWD.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Rules 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13 are outdated and redundant. IAC 871-66 replaced much of these unnecessary sections.

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

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13

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

1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	7
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	3157
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	15

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

No.