

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

Department Name:	Transportation	Date:	08/14/25	Total Rule Count:	8
IAC #:	761	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	813	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	327F.13
Contact Name:	Maria Hobbs	Email:	Maria.hobbs@iowadot.us	Phone:	515-239-1088

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

This chapter complies with Iowa Code section 327F.13 concerning close clearance warning signs. The rules define the criteria of a "close clearance," identify what type of obstructions warrant the placement of a warning sign, and concern enforcement and reimbursement of close clearance signing. If obstacles are unable to be removed and meet the close clearance criteria, a railroad operator must place signage near the close clearance to notify railroad employees riding the side of a train of the safety concern.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes. The rules provide consistent evaluation of obstacles and uniform signage placement to identify safety concerns.

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

There are no costs to the public to comply with this chapter.

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

Railroad owners will install close-clearance warning signs if the chapter applies to their affected (railroads, businesses/industries with rail spurs, etc.) operations. There will be a minimal cost to the affected parties.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Iowa Code section 327F.13 requires the adoption of close clearance warning signs rules. The chapter provides consistent assessment of railroad operations and safety improvements for railroad employees.

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, there is limited close clearance obstacles, and a sign placement is a minor expense that benefits the safety of railroad employees. Neighboring states have very similar language of sign placement to warn for close clearance obstacles.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

813.1 was amended to remove language that is unnecessary and duplicative of statute.

813.2 was amended to remove language that is duplicative of statute.

813.3 was amended to remove an obsolete office name.

813.4 was amended to remove language that is unnecessary.
 813.5 was amended to remove language that repeats the statute and unnecessarily restrictive terms.
 813.6 was amended to remove unnecessarily restrictive terms.
 813.9 was amended to remove unnecessarily restrictive terms.
 813.10 was amended to remove unnecessarily restrictive terms.

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

813.2 Applicability. This rule is proposed to be reworded and moved to rule 813.1.
 813.3 Information. This rule is proposed to be reworded and moved to rule 813.1.
 813.4 Definitions. This rule is proposed to be reworded and moved to rule 813.1.

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

813.1
 813.2
 813.3
 813.4
 813.5

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	3
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	160
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	26

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

None.