

## Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2024)

|                         |                |  |  |  |                            |
|-------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|----------------------------|
| <b>Department Name:</b> | Transportation | <b>Date:</b>                                 | 12-29-23   | <b>Total Rule Count:</b>                   | 3                          |
| <b>IAC #:</b>           | 761            | <b>Chapter/<br/>SubChapter/<br/>Rule(s):</b> | 170  | <b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b> | No specific rule authority |
| <b>Contact Name:</b>    | Nicole Moore   | <b>Email:</b>                                | <a href="mailto:Nicole.moore@iowadot.us">Nicole.moore@iowadot.us</a> | <b>Phone:</b>                              | 515.460.0763               |

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

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

To establish requirements for the counties' allocation of farm-to-market funds, in accordance with Iowa Code section 310.27.

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

Yes. The requirements and instructions are published on the Local Systems Bureau webpage. Having this in an I.M. is more efficient than having it in the Administrative Rules. I.M.s are more easily changed if procedures need to change.

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

No costs incurred by the public.

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

No costs incurred by the agency or others to implement and enforce these administrative rules.

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

Since there are no costs incurred, the benefits of the chapter being eliminated, and information included in the Instructions are recognized as a government efficiency.

**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.**

A Local Systems I.M. already documents requirements. Counties have multiple opportunities to provide input to I.M.s. Each time there is a change requested to the I.M.s, the Department seeks stakeholder input. [https://www.iowadot.gov/local\\_systems/publications/im/2120.pdf](https://www.iowadot.gov/local_systems/publications/im/2120.pdf)

**Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Not obsolete, outdated or inconsistent. The I.M. and Administrative Rules are redundant, and the language already is included in the I.M. on procedures for counties to allocate farm-to-market funds. It could remain in the I.M. rather than the Administrative Rules.

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

761 IAC 170:  
170.1 Purpose  
170.2 Contact Information  
170.3 Temporary allocation

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

None.

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

**METRICS**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Total number of rules repealed:</b>   | <b>3</b>   |
| <b>Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b>                   | <b>384</b> |
| <b>Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b> | <b>11</b>  |

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

No.