

## Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2024)

<b>Department Name:</b>	Transportation	<b>Date:</b>	5-29-24	<b>Total Rule Count:</b>	12
<b>IAC #:</b>	761	<b>Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):</b>	101	<b>Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:</b>	306.6A
<b>Contact Name:</b>	Garrett Pedersen	<b>Email:</b>	<a href="mailto:garrett.pedersen@iowadot.us">garrett.pedersen@iowadot.us</a>	<b>Phone:</b>	515-239-1027

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

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

The benefit of the rules is to provide collaborative guidance from subject matter experts on the designation and subsequent state funding distribution to a road network that serves to move agricultural product.

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

Yes, the farm-to-market road designation facilitates the distribution of state funding, and this chapter outlines the function of the Farm-to-Market Review Board (board) in determining which roads are eligible to gain this designation. The farm-to-market system is not to exceed 35,000 miles and, as such, the board reviews each county’s share of that total to maximize the effectiveness of the funds being distributed. The board membership is appointed by the Iowa County Engineers Association and represents great institutional and professional knowledge that helps to designate a system that is beneficial to the state.

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

There are no costs incurred by the public to comply with the rules.

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

Costs to the Department directly associated with the chapter include the staff time associated with the preparation of materials and administration of activities for the board.

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

Yes, the costs relate to staff time to help facilitate the board meetings, which allows the board to maximize their time serving as subject matter experts.

**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.**

There are no alternatives, as these rules provide guidance for necessary ongoing administrative activities, which would need to be documented for another appointed body to administer.

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**

101.1(1) thru 101.1(3) are duplicative of statutory language.  
101.4(1) Some language within 101.4(1) is unnecessary.  
101.6 is duplicative of statutory language.

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

101.6

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

101.1 Purpose.  
101.2 Definitions.  
101.3 Composition and membership of the board.  
101.4 Collection of system modification requests and frequency of meetings.  
101.5 Procedure for requesting modifications to the farm-to-market road system.  
101.6 Voting and approval of requested modifications.  
101.7 Report of board decision to applicant county.  
101.8 Reapplication for modifications.  
101.9 Judicial review.  
101.10 Adoption and modification of rules.  
101.11 Severability clause.

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

#### METRICS

<b>Total number of rules repealed:</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b>	<b>252</b>
<b>Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation</b>	<b>42</b>

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

No