

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

<b>Department Name:</b>	Transportation	<b>Date:</b>	08/14/25	<b>Total Rule Count:</b>	4
<b>IAC #:</b>	761	<b>Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):</b>	812	<b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b>	No specific rulemaking authority
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Maria Hobbs	<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:Maria.hobbs@iowadot.us">Maria.hobbs@iowadot.us</a>	<b>Phone:</b>	515-239-1088

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

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

The chapter states that all public highway railroad grade crossings will be ranked for the accident prediction factor with a consistent classification and standard formula based upon their characteristics, conditions, and hazards.

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

The Department has established a methodology and classification formula that is used to rank all public grade crossings that is already available on the Department's website. This information is consistent with the Federal Railroad Administration's accident prediction methodology formula. Annually, a report of all crossings and their rankings is provided to the road authorities and railroad operators for their respective crossings. The rankings can be used to establish prioritization of funds from the federal-aid grade crossing safety fund program administered by the Department.

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

The public does not incur any costs.

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

The Department does not incur any costs to implement the rules.

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

Development of a methodology and a formula to calculate a uniform classification of public grade crossing characteristics and rank them for accident predictability is valuable information shared with the road authorities and railroad operators of those crossings.

### 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 Department determined there is a less restrictive alternative to the rules. Chapter 812 is redundant and unnecessary. Iowa Code section 307.26(7)"b" requires the Department to establish a standard and classification system for public crossings but Iowa Code doesn't say it must be established by rule. The classification and ranking of highway-railroad grade crossings is available on the Department's website: [Federal Aid Crossing Safety Program | Department of Transportation.](#)

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**

**812.1** removes wording that is unnecessary and redundant.  
**812.2** removes wording that is unnecessary.  
**812.3** removes wording that is unnecessary.  
**812.4** removes wording that is unnecessary and is duplicative of statutory language.

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

812.1  
 812.2  
 812.3  
 812.4

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

None, the Department proposes to permanently rescind this chapter.

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

**METRICS**

<b>Total number of rules repealed:</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b>	<b>661</b>
<b>Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b>	<b>10</b>

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

No.