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

Department	Iowa Public	Date:	April 17, 2025	Total Rule	17
Name:	Information			Count:	
	Board				
	497	Chapter/	6	Iowa Code	23
IAC #:		SubChapter/		Section	
		Rule(s):		Authorizing	
				Rule:	
Contact	Kimberly	Email:	Kim.murphy@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-393-
Name:	Murphy				7664

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

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

The Iowa Administrative Procedure Act has long required agencies to adopt rules regarding declaratory orders. To satisfy these obligations, the board promulgated Chapter 6 consistent with the Uniform Rules on Agency Procedure.

2024 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2370, rescinds some applicable law (section 4) and creates a new related statute (section 12). The new statute states that the administrative rules coordinator, in partnership with the Iowa Attorney General's Office, may adopt a new set of uniform model rules that will automatically apply to agencies in the absence of self-promulgated rules (more information can be found in Iowa Code section 17A.24 as enacted by 2024 Iowa Acts, Senate File 2370).

Chapter 6 is being rescinded consistent with the principles of Executive Order 10 as being either unauthorized or unnecessary. IPIB will instead operate under the new model rules and other applicable laws.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes, the benefit is being achieved. The Iowa Public Information Board successfully operates pursuant to Iowa Code Chapter 23 and processes numerous complaints every year. The Iowa Public Information Board will maintain alignment with uniform model rules or existing Iowa laws.

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

Not applicable. This rule is being rescinded.

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

Not applicable. This rule is being rescinded.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Not applicable. This rule is being rescinded.

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.

Not applicable. This rule is being rescinded.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

No.

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

497 – Rule 6.1 - 6.17

### 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

Total number of rules repealed:	17
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	6022
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	126

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