

Regulatory Analysis

Notice of Intended Action to be published: 281—Chapter 46
“Career and Technical Education”

Iowa Code section(s) or chapter(s) authorizing rulemaking: 256.129(5)
State or federal law(s) implemented by the rulemaking: Iowa Code section 256.136

Public Hearing

A public hearing at which persons may present their views orally or in writing will be held as follows:

April 8, 2025
8 to 8:45 a.m.

Room B100
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, Iowa

Public Comment

Any interested person may submit written or oral comments concerning this Regulatory Analysis, which must be received by the Department of Education no later than 4:30 p.m. on the date of the public hearing. Comments should be directed to:

Thomas A. Mayes, General Counsel
Grimes State Office Building
400 East 14th Street
Des Moines, Iowa 50319
Phone: 515.281.8661
Email: thomas.mayes@iowa.gov

Purpose and Summary

This proposed rulemaking removes a superfluous reference to federal funds from the rule on regional planning partnerships (RPPs). RPP funds are state dollars, and any use of federal funds to support an RPP’s work would be solely governed by federal law.

Analysis of Impact

1. **Persons affected by the proposed rulemaking:**
 - **Classes of persons that will bear the costs of the proposed rulemaking:**
There are no costs.
 - **Classes of persons that will benefit from the proposed rulemaking:**
RPPs and their participants will benefit from the additional clarity in this proposed rulemaking.
2. **Impact of the proposed rulemaking, economic or otherwise, including the nature and amount of all the different kinds of costs that would be incurred:**
 - **Quantitative description of impact:**
There is no quantitative impact.
 - **Qualitative description of impact:**
There is a positive qualitative impact in that the rule will become more clear.
3. **Costs to the State:**
 - **Implementation and enforcement costs borne by the agency or any other agency:**
There are no costs noted.
 - **Anticipated effect on state revenues:**

There is no anticipated effect on state revenues.

4. Comparison of the costs and benefits of the proposed rulemaking to the costs and benefits of inaction:

The statute requires rules.

5. Determination whether less costly methods or less intrusive methods exist for achieving the purpose of the proposed rulemaking:

None were considered. The statute requires rules.

6. Alternative methods considered by the agency:

• **Description of any alternative methods that were seriously considered by the agency:**

None were considered.

• **Reasons why alternative methods were rejected in favor of the proposed rulemaking:**

The statute requires rules.

Small Business Impact

If the rulemaking will have a substantial impact on small business, include a discussion of whether it would be feasible and practicable to do any of the following to reduce the impact of the rulemaking on small business:

• Establish less stringent compliance or reporting requirements in the rulemaking for small business.

• Establish less stringent schedules or deadlines in the rulemaking for compliance or reporting requirements for small business.

• Consolidate or simplify the rulemaking's compliance or reporting requirements for small business.

• Establish performance standards to replace design or operational standards in the rulemaking for small business.

• Exempt small business from any or all requirements of the rulemaking.

If legal and feasible, how does the rulemaking use a method discussed above to reduce the substantial impact on small business?

There is no impact on small business.

Text of Proposed Rulemaking

ITEM 1. Amend subrule 46.10(6), introductory paragraph, as follows:

46.10(6) *Secondary career and technical education funds.* An approved regional career and technical education partnership may use funds received from state ~~and federal~~ sources on behalf of school districts and community colleges participating in the regional career and technical education planning partnership for the following: