MINUTES

OCTOBER 2026 MEETING
ADMINISTRATIVE RULES REVIEW COMMITTEE

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Kara Warme, Chair
Senator Mike Bousselot
Senator Dan Dawson
Senator Janet Petersen
Senator Cindy Winckler
Representative Chad Ingels, Vice Chair
Representative Austin Harris
Representative Rick L. Olson

EX OFFICIO, NONVOTING MEMBER: Stan Thompson, Administrative Rules Coordinator, Office of the Governor

LSA CONTACTS: Organizational staffing provided and minutes prepared by Jack Ewing, Administrative Code Editor, 515.281.6048, and Natalie Sherman, Legal Counsel, 515.725.2299

BULLETINS NEEDED FOR THIS MEETING: 9/16/26, 9/30/26

Procedural Business

Senator Warme convened the regular, statutory meeting of the Administrative Rules Review Committee (ARRC) at 11 a.m. on Monday, October 12, 2026, in Room 116, State Capitol, Des Moines, Iowa. The minutes of the September 14, 2026, meeting were approved. The next meeting was scheduled for Monday, November 9, 2026, at 10:00 a.m. The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Fiscal Overview

Mr. Nathan Moore, Fiscal Legislative Analyst, presented the LSA fiscal report.

HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Victoria Daniels

ARC 0623D (NOIA), Functions of Division, Juvenile Justice Youth Development Program, Chs. 30, 31

Committee members asked about the federally required advisory council that is solely referenced in the administrative rules in Chapter 30, and what entity would be the new advisory group if the rulemaking removed the juvenile justice chapter. Ms. Daniels responded that she would discuss the matter with the Department of Public Safety and provide additional information to the committee at a later date.

No action taken on ARC 0623D.

Rulemaking type is indicated in parentheses following the ARC number. The acronyms have the following meanings: Regulatory Analysis (**RA**), Notice of Intended Action (**NOIA**), Amended Notice of Intended Action (**ANOIA**), Notice of Termination (**NOT**), Adopted and Filed Emergency (**AFE**), Filed Emergency After Notice (**FEAN**), and Adopted and Filed (**AF**).

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Victoria Daniels, Ryan Page

ARC 0625D (NOIA), Child Care Services, Ch. 170

Committee members asked about the copay required by the childcare assistance pilot program, and whether the intended copay amounts had been determined and would be part of the public comments. Ms. Page responded that under the rulemaking, the copays would remain the same as they are currently and would not change.

No action taken on ARC 0625D.

PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Victoria Daniels, Owen Parker

ARC 0624D (NOIA), Medical Cannabidiol Program, Rules 154.1, 154.3(3), 154.11, 154.39(2)"a"

Committee members asked about the inclusion of veterans as a class eligible for the $25 registration card, rather than the $100 registration card, and why veterans were not included in the Iowa Code as an eligible class. Mr. Parker responded that veteran eligibility was not expressly in the Iowa Code, but the department had authority to include veterans as an eligible class in the rulemaking. He noted that the decision was discussed with the medical cannabidiol board, and that veterans constituted only 5 percent of the patient population utilizing the cost reduction. He further noted that veterans had been included in a previous version of the rules years prior, and the committee had not taken issue with their inclusion at that time. Members responded that three legislative sessions had passed during which veterans had not expressly been included for the cost reduction, and that this change would be more appropriate for consideration by the legislature.

No action taken on ARC 0624D.

UTILITIES COMMISSION

Representing the agency: Stephanie Weisenbach, Hunter Fors

ARC 0627D (NOIA), Restoration of Agricultural Lands During Electric Transmission Line Construction, Chs. 8, 11

Committee members asked why the public hearing date was set so far in the future. Mr. Fors responded that the date was selected in January because the commission has a busy calendar including hearings that had already been scheduled. Ms. Weisenbach noted that the projects that the rulemaking would relate to are not currently before the commission or part of any open docket.

No action taken on ARC 0627D.

COLLEGE STUDENT AID COMMISSION

Representing the agency: Katrina Holck

RA 26-310 (RA), Attorney Loan Repayment Program, Ch. 26

Committee members asked about the comments received from the Iowa Bar Association. Ms. Holck responded that the Iowa Bar Association raised three concerns, including an idea to include pro bono work as a consideration for awardees, preferential treatment for state public defenders, and consideration for students who may become licensed. She noted that pro bono work is voluntary and not tied to an individual's income level, that public defenders are paid a salary to work on indigent defense cases and preferential treatment would restrict the demographic of awardees for the program, and that the program acts as an incentive for newly licensed attorneys to remain in Iowa and work in rural areas of the state.

Committee members asked about the definition of law school including a law school accredited by the American Bar Association (ABA) or another accrediting body. Ms. Holck responded that, currently, the ABA is the only accrediting body, but the rulemaking remains flexible if another accrediting body is

determined at some point in the future. Members noted that this definition conflicts with the Iowa Supreme Court requirement for a degree from an ABA-accredited law school.

Seth Jones, on behalf of Carney & Appleby, summarized written comments submitted to the committee, including clarifying language in the rulemaking, suggested changes to definitions, and clarifications of accreditation and licensing requirements.

AGRICULTURE AND LAND STEWARDSHIP DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Colin Tadlock, Dr. Katie Rumsey

ARC 0636D (NOIA), Registration of Iowa-Foaled Horses, Ch. 62

Committee members asked why a public hearing had not been scheduled. Mr. Tadlock responded that a public hearing regarding the regulatory analysis had been held over the summer, and the department recently received, and is considering, comments from the Iowa Thoroughbred Breeders and Owners Association (Thoroughbred Association). Members asked about the comments. He responded that the changes made by the rulemaking to the program primarily included removing the word "dog," and that the comments from the Thoroughbred Association had only been received the day prior and had not yet been considered fully. Members asked about the disciplinary portion of the rulemaking, and how the department decided to implement disciplinary rules without statutory authority to do so. He responded that the Thoroughbred Association had also commented on the disciplinary portion, and that the department would review the rulemaking and consider changes.

No action taken on ARC 0636D.

ARC 0638D (NOIA), Infectious and Contagious Diseases, Ch. 64

Committee members asked about reportable diseases, including Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome (PRRS), a very common and prevalent disease in pigs, and whether every documented incident is reported. Mr. Tadlock responded that the reportable disease list is extensive, and some diseases are more common or routine while others are more significant and severe. Dr. Rumsey noted that the list of reportable diseases is consistent with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and that PRRS had been on the list for a long time. She explained that some diseases may not be actionable but are reported for the sake of tracking the number of cases. Members asked whether the department released a report of the reportable diseases each year. She responded in the negative. Mr. Tadlock also noted that the department had held a public hearing on the regulatory analysis of the rulemaking, and incorporated all of the feedback into the notice of intended action. Members asked if the rulemaking could become effective without a public hearing on the notice. Mr. Ewing responded in the affirmative and explained the statutory standards for public hearings.

No action taken on ARC 0638D.

ARC 0639D (NOIA), Animal and Livestock Importation, Ch. 65

Committee members asked about the pseudorabies outbreak in one herd, and whether that occurred because the herd did not fulfill the importation process. Dr. Rumsey responded that through the department's investigation, it was determined that the herd did not meet import requirements, and the department was taking action subsequent to this finding.

No action taken on ARC 0639D.

SOIL CONSERVATION AND WATER QUALITY DIVISION

Representing the agency: Colin Tadlock, Susan Kozak

ARC 0559D (NOIA), Iowa Financial Incentive Program for Soil Erosion Control, Ch. 10

Committee members asked about the county allocation of funds, and whether the breakdown percentages are in the Iowa Code or determined by the department. Mr. Tadlock responded that the percentages are not in the Iowa Code but had been used historically. Members asked if there was historical documentation of how the percentages were determined. He responded that he would provide that information to the committee at a later date.

Committee members asked whether there had been consideration of different priorities in the current environment. Mr. Tadlock responded that most conservation practices had layered benefits, and geography was a primary consideration, but the priorities are largely determined by local partners. Members asked whether no-till and cover crops qualified for a one-time payment only. Ms. Kozak responded that no-till is a one-time payment, but cover crops could receive payments for multiple years, with first-time users receiving an increased incentive.

No action taken on ARC 0559D.

ARC 0572D (NOIA), Soil and Water Resource Conservation Plans, Ch. 22

Committee members asked whether shifting approval plans from the committee to the department was a legislative change. Mr. Tadlock responded that the change was part of the boards and commissions review completed during a previous session. Members asked when the last state plan was completed and when the next was expected. Ms. Kozak responded that all 100 conservation district plans had been reviewed five years ago, and were currently being reviewed again.

No action taken on ARC 0572D.

ARC 0575D (NOIA), Water Quality Initiative, Ch. 16

Committee members asked whether feedback on the regulatory analysis had been received during the public hearing. Mr. Tadlock responded in the negative. Members asked whether the Water Resources Coordinating Council was an active participant in the rulemaking. He responded that the division met with the Water Resources Coordinating Council on a quarterly basis, and spoke regularly with stakeholders.

No action taken on ARC 0575D.

CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Jen Rathje, Shannon Archer

ARC 0612D (NOIA), Temporary Holding Facilities, Ch. 51

Note: ARC 0612D and 0613D were reviewed and discussed collectively.

Committee members asked about the primary clarifications made to the rulemaking based on public comments. Ms. Rathje responded that the department and stakeholders identified seven primary areas that required updating and clarification and were updated and clarified prior to the notice of intended action.

Committee members asked whether visitation was allowed at jails and prisons. Ms. Rathje responded that county jails set their own standards for visitation processes. Ms. Archer noted that the chief jail inspector is the only oversight over the county jails. She explained that visitation at prisons was permitted as long as it was safe and secure to hold visitation, but requirements could be adjusted if an incident occurred where visitation would not be safe. Members asked whether any state prisons currently did not allow visitation. She responded that all state prisons currently permit visitation, but that she would confirm such and follow up with the committee. Ms. Rathje also noted that if in-person visitation had to be paused for any reason, online video visitation was still permitted.

No action taken on ARC 0612D.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Representing the agency: Lisa Connell

ARC 0576D (NOIA), Red Tape Review, Chs. 301-304

Committee members asked about the use of funds from the Arts and Culture Enhancement Fund, and whether new programs were being created with the funds or where the money would go when closing down certain grant programs. Ms. Connell responded that the new Arts and Culture Enhancement Fund broadened the funding in the area of arts and culture to allow for larger projects to receive funding. She explained that the funds were put into different projects with the increased flexibility, including taking multiple smaller grant programs and making them into fewer, larger, and broader opportunities. Members asked whether the total dollars invested in arts and culture was decreased. She responded in the negative.

No action taken on ARC 0576D.

INSPECTIONS, APPEALS, AND LICENSING DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Emily DeRonde

ARC 0596D (AF), Speech Pathologists and Audiologists — Licensure, Interstate Compact, Background Checks, Fees, Ch. 740

Committee members asked about out-of-state licensed individuals moving to the state, and whether they would be required to work under someone in the state for a year in order to be licensed in the state. Ms. DeRonde responded that such individuals could receive a temporary license to work in the state, but would need to work under someone else unless the individual has a certificate of clinical competence already obtained through the association, in which case they would not need supervision and could be licensed automatically.

No action taken on ARC 0596D.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

Representing the agency: Brooke Axiotis, Jeffrey Koncsol, Scott Perkins, Michelle McNertney, Georgia Van Gundy

ARC 0630D (NOIA), Career Training Physical Expansion Program, Ch. 70

Committee members asked whether the program is meant to fund an expansion of training facilities. Ms. McNertney responded in the affirmative. Members asked what the administrative fee covered for the department. She responded that most money was specific to a program or grant for a particular purpose, so minimal funding was required to run the notice of a funding opportunity, issue and maintain contracts, and ensure compliance with funding usage. Members asked how much of the funding was used for such purposes. She responded that 2 percent of the total fund, or $70,000 over the course of the five-year program, which is lower than the typical 5 percent fee.

No action taken on ARC 0630D.

ARC 0631D (NOIA), Procedures for Workers Desiring to File a Claim for Benefits for Unemployment Insurance; Benefit Eligibility Conditions, Rules 24.2, 24.15

Committee members asked whether funding had been identified for the program, as a funding source was not identified in the legislation. Mr. Perkins responded that the department was working with the U.S. Department of Labor to potentially use federal Reed Act funds to cover the ongoing costs of the program, and was also considering other funding sources.

No action taken on ARC 0631D.

Committee members asked whether the department was working in conjunction with the Iowa Industrial New Jobs Training Program Interim Study Committee when creating the rulemaking. Ms. Van Gundy responded that the study committee was required to meet by August 1, and the charge of the committee did not involve input on the rulemaking. Members noted that the study committee had another meeting scheduled in November, and asked whether the department would accept comments from the interim committee. She responded that the department had 20 meetings across the state with employers to discuss workforce training and other programs, and continued to meet with interested parties, including presenting information and asking for feedback. Members asked who the appropriate person would be for the study committee to contact with feedback rather than the public hearing. She responded that the study committee could contact her directly.

Ms. Emily Shields, the executive director of Community Colleges for Iowa, spoke on behalf of the 15 community colleges in the state. She noted that the community colleges and their business partners had raised concerns during the regulatory analysis that had not been addressed. She said the issue was with the rulemaking including policies that the legislature had considered and chose not to adopt, and that the rulemaking did not comply with Executive Order 10. She detailed the specific portions of the rulemaking at issue, including eligible training and costs not required by the legislature.

Peter Hird, representing the Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, asked about the changes made to the definition of "new job." Ms. Van Gundy responded that the definition would be changed back to the prior version.

Committee members asked about the administrative costs, set by the legislation at 15 percent, but that the department set the administrative costs at 7 percent. Members noted that the law did not include the flexibility to reduce the administrative costs in that manner and that the rulemaking narrowed allowable administrative costs more than the legislative intent. Ms. Van Gundy responded that the financing mechanism for the program is bonding, making the program very expensive, with a 40 percent administrative cost, and that the statute said an administrative cost is an allowable cost to run the program, so the department set it at 7 percent. Members asked whether there were additional costs. She responded that community colleges get another fee when they identify a vendor to provide training, and that community colleges could access interest from outstanding bond proceeds. Members asked how taxpayers paid for the cost of bonds. She responded that the costs of bonds came from withholding tax, and that bonds can only be issued for seven years. Members asked for more information about the fiscal impact of the rulemaking. Mr. Evan Johnson, LSA Fiscal Legislative Analyst, explained that revenue to the General Fund would increase due to the rulemaking reducing the amount of administrative costs.

Committee members requested that the department not adopt the rules until after the study committee filed a final report with the legislature.

No action taken on ARC 0629D.