

Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 2025)

Department Name:	IEDA	Date:	12/14/23	Total Rule Count:	5
IAC #:	261	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	Chapter # 175	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	Chapter 15
Contact Name:	Lisa Connell	Email:	Lisa.connell@iowaeda.com	Phone:	(515) 348-6163

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

To establish standard application and approval procedures for multiple IEDA programs, so such programs could be administered as consistently as possible.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

No. All programs to which the chapter applies, except the high quality jobs program, have been repealed and have no open award agreements. IEDA intends to include the applicable requirements in Chapter 68 relating to the high quality jobs program when that chapter is repromulgated.

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

Participants in IEDA programs require staff time to apply for and receive approval for incentive awards. Some businesses may also choose to rely on an external service provider, such as an accountant or attorney, to provide information to IEDA. The amount of the costs will vary, depending on the compensation of such staff or service provider. Minimal time is required to provide the required documentation.

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

IEDA staff time is required review applications, oversee the approval process, and communicate with applicants.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. Only businesses that will potentially benefit from the program incur any costs. The costs to the state to administer the program are proportional to the business activities incented.

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.

The application and approval process detailed in the rules are no more than necessary to implement the statutory framework for the applicable programs.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Yes, the chapter as a whole will be obsolete when the applicable requirements are incorporated into Chapter 68 relating to the high quality jobs program.

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

175.1
175.2
175.3
175.4
175.5

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

None. The portions of the chapter relevant to the high quality jobs program will be incorporated into chapter 68.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	5
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	1981
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	38

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

No.