

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

|                         |                |  |                           |  |                                  |
|-------------------------|----------------|--|---------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| <b>Department Name:</b> | Transportation | <b>Date:</b>                                 | 4/3/2025                  | <b>Total Rule Count:</b>                   | 1                                |
| <b>IAC #:</b>           | 761            | <b>Chapter/<br/>SubChapter/<br/>Rule(s):</b> | 181                       | <b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b> | No specific rulemaking authority |
| <b>Contact Name:</b>    | James Nelson   | <b>Email:</b>                                | James.s.nelson@iowadot.us | <b>Phone:</b>                              | 515 239-1206                     |

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

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

The rule establishes a statewide standard that allows a local authority to issue a special permit for a fence-line feeder, grain cart, tank wagon or tracked implement of husbandry with a weight in excess of the weights allowed under Iowa Code chapter 321 to operate within its jurisdiction.

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

Unknown. There is no tracking mechanism to know if special permits are being requested and issued by a local jurisdiction.

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

Unknown. Special permit costs are set by the local jurisdiction.

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

Local agencies may incur administrative and engineering costs for each instance of issuing a special permit. There are no costs to the Department to implement and enforce the rule.

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

Yes. Without this special permit mechanism there is no legal way to transport fence-line feeder, grain cart, tank wagon or tracked implement of husbandry with a weight in excess of the weights allowed under Iowa Code chapter 321. The benefit is to allow these implements to move safely within a jurisdiction.

**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 that adopting the standard required in Iowa Code section 321.463(4) could be established within the Department’s Bridge Load Rating Manual, which is available on the Department’s website, instead of by administrative rule. [https://iowadot.gov/siims/IowaDOT\\_BridgeRatingManual.pdf](https://iowadot.gov/siims/IowaDOT_BridgeRatingManual.pdf)

Iowa Code establishes legal operating axle loads and axle spacings that bridges are evaluated against. Loads that fall outside those legal parameters cannot be operated safely without special analysis. Increasing legal loads would result in load posting bridges that further restricts transportation. The special permit allows for

an overweight load to be evaluated based on the specific axle loads, axle spacing and route of travel and is the least restrictive method to allow overweight loads.

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]):**

181.1

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

None, the Department plans to permanently rescind this chapter.

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

#### METRICS

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Total number of rules repealed:   | 1   |
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation                   | 354 |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 2   |

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

No