

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

Department Name:	Homeland Sec. & Emergency Mgt	Date:	9/25/25	Total Rule Count:	17
IAC #:	605	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	10	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	34A
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?

To provide additional guidelines for the use of emergency phone systems within the state.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Yes, the rules of this section provide structure and policy for phone systems, public safety answering points, and overall function of the 911 system in Iowa.

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

None—the rule itself does not generate any additional cost to the public. The rule does adopt Federal Regulations and industry standards to ensure a consistent 911 standard across the state however these do not come with any additional costs to the public.

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

Complying with the rule could generate some associated costs to ensure that all Public Safety Answering Points and phone systems that operate within the state are to the Federal Regulatory and Industry Standard to ensure a certain level of 911 consistency throughout the state.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes, the associated tangential cost would be minimal to ensure a consistent 911 standard.

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 implement policies around 911 taking existing Iowa Code, Federal Regulation, and industry standard for the safety and benefit of all Iowans and those experiencing an emergency within the state.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

Some out of date and obsolete language has been removed, restrictive words will be modified to the extent possible. The chapter has been reorganized for better clarity. A significant amount of restated code has been removed.

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

The Chapter has been reorganized. A total of 4 Rules will be eliminated.

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

The Chapter has been reorganized. 605.10 1-13 will be re-promulgated although, these are different as they have been reorganized.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	4
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	3,635
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	57

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

No

