# **Red Tape Review Rule Report**

(Due: September 1, 2025)

Department	Department of	Date:	08/14/2025	Total Rule	10
Name:	Transportation			Count:	
	761	Chapter/	164	Iowa Code	307.12
IAC #:		SubChapter/		Section	
		Rule(s):		Authorizing	
				Rule:	
Contact Name:	Jan Laaser-	Email:	jan.laaser-	Phone:	515.239.1349
	Webb		webb@iowadot.us		

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

What	ic tha	intend	ad han	ofit o	f tha	rula?
wnai	is the	intena	ea ben	em o	ııne	ruies

The intended benefit of the rules is to efficiently and effectively administer the Traffic Safety Improvement Program (TSIP).

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

Yes. Each year, applications for the TSIP are received and processed between August and November. Award recommendations are provided to the Transportation Commission in November with a request for approval made in December. The majority of agreements are developed and executed January through April. More than 95% of available funds are awarded annually.

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?

There are no costs to the agency or any others to implement and enforce these administrative rules.

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

Since there are no costs incurred from the implementation and enforcement of these administrative rules, the benefits are justified. These rules serve to manage a program that reduces crashes, which makes the benefits tangible.

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.

			•				
No	. Rules are	required to	effectively ac	lminister the p	rogram.		

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

<b>164.1</b> removes unnecessary and duplicative content.
<b>164.2</b> was deleted due to being unnecessary as its content was combined with rule 164.1.
<b>164.3</b> removes unnecessarily restrictive terms.
<b>164.4</b> removes unnecessarily restrictive terms.
<b>164.5</b> was deleted due to being unnecessary as its content was combined with rule 164.3.
<b>164.6</b> and <b>164.7</b> were deleted due to being unnecessary as the content of both rules was combined with
rule 164.4.
<b>164.8</b> removes unnecessarily restrictive terms.
<b>164.9</b> removes unnecessarily restrictive terms.
<b>164.10</b> removes unnecessarily restrictive terms.

RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):				
164.2				
164.5				
164.6				
164.7				

RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):	
164.1	
164.2	
164.3	
164.4	
164.5	
164.6	
164.7	

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

## **METRICS**

Total number of rules repealed:	4
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	1
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	18

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?				
No.				