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

Department Name:	Homeland Sec. & Emergency Mgt	**Date:**	7-9-2025	**Total Rule Count:**	4
IAC #:	605	**Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):**	9	**Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:**	29C.8
Contact Name:	Blake DeRouchey	**Email:**	Blake.derouchey@iowa.gov	**Phone:**	515-323-4232

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

In accordance with Iowa Code section 29C.8, HSEM is required to maintain various emergency and disaster plans. This Chapter details those plans, their purpose, and public access to the plans.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes, the planning documents are required by 29C.8, as well as one of the plans required by Federal Code. Plans are continually reviewed on a schedule and tested via training, exercise, and real-life response. Plans are modified after real life events to incorporate lessons learned.

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

None—the rule does not come with an associated cost to the public. However, without the plans and planning process, Iowa would be substantially worse off to respond to and recover from disasters, potentially costing the state significant funding.

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

There are no direct costs. Most of the costs associated with this rule come from staff time required to update and maintain the plans.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. As detailed above, the planning process is valuable to the state's overall ability to respond to and recover from disasters. Without the planning process, it's very likely disasters would be more costly and potentially cause more damage to life and property

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 Rule does not restrict the public or the private sector, but seeks to better plan for all hazards for better response, mitigation, and recovery.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Some of the language in the existing rule was repetitive, and will be consolidated and eliminated. This also helped remove restrictive terms.

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

None

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

605.9 1-4

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	0
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	139
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	3

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

No