



# MINUTES

## NOVEMBER 2025 MEETING ADMINISTRATIVE RULES REVIEW COMMITTEE

---

### MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator David D. Rowley, Vice Chair  
Senator Mike Boussetot  
Senator Dan Dawson  
Senator Sarah Trone Garriott  
Senator Cindy Winckler

Representative Chad Ingels, Chair  
Representative Rick L. Olson  
Representative Ryan Weldon

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: 10/15/25, 10/29/25**

---

#### **Procedural Business**

Representative Ingels convened the regular, statutory meeting of the Administrative Rules Review Committee (ARRC) at 10 a.m. on Monday, November 10, 2025, in Room 116, State Capitol, Des Moines, Iowa. Senator Rowley introduced himself to the committee. The minutes of the September 8, 2025, meeting were approved. The next meeting was scheduled for December 8, 2025, at 10 a.m. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

#### **Fiscal Overview**

Mr. Chris Ubben, Division/Editor Supervisor, presented the LSA fiscal report. Regarding ARC 9641C, committee members asked how the cost estimates were determined. Ms. Lindsey Ingraham, Fiscal Legislative Analyst, responded that the estimates came from the fiscal note for 2025 Iowa Acts, Senate File 659, at which time the estimates had been provided by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). She noted that at the time that the Notice of Intended Action had been filed on the rulemaking, there had been no further or different cost estimate. Members asked whether the HHS provided reasoning for the cost estimate. She responded that she would provide members with the formula and reasoning at a later date.

Rulemaking type is indicated in parentheses following the ARC number. The acronyms have the following meanings: 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).

## **TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT**

Representing the agency: Ryan Pell, Michael Todsén

ARC 9607C (NOIA), Statewide Standard for Permitting Certain Implements of Husbandry, Ch. 181

Committee members asked whether an internal memo that would replace the rescinded rules had been posted on the department's website. Mr. Todsén responded in the negative and noted that the memo would be posted soon. Members asked how the internal memo would be utilized by the department. He responded that the memo mirrored the existing administrative rules, and would provide guidance to local public agencies on issuing permits for certain implements of husbandry. Members requested a draft of the memo. Mr. Pell stated that he would provide a copy.

Committee members asked how farmers knew whether they would need a permit under the rulemaking. Mr. Todsén responded that farmers operating certain implements knew the weight of the equipment and the legal limits in place, and that the rulemaking would have no impact on farmers.

Committee members asked whether the rulemaking would eliminate administrative rules and replace them with policy, and the reason for the change. Mr. Todsén responded in the affirmative, and noted that the change was made in response to Executive Order 10. Mr. Pell noted that the nature and scope of the rulemaking would make it equally as administrable as policy and fits within the criteria of Executive Order 10 to reduce administrative regulations.

No action taken on ARC 9607C.

## **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY**

Representing the agency: Lisa Connell

ARC 9608C (NOIA), Business Incentives for Growth (BIG) Program, Ch. 69

Committee members asked what type of reinvestment in a facility would qualify as modernizing facilities under the rulemaking. Ms. Connell responded that the rulemaking emphasized manufacturing 4.0 technology and the integration of automation and technology.

Committee members asked whether the rulemaking placed restrictions on jobs created under the program. Ms. Connell responded that a contract under the program would last between 2 and 10 years, during which time a participating entity must maintain the number of jobs determined by contract as well as maintain the entity's base level of employees. She noted that generally applicable language applied for facility closure and layoffs.

Committee members asked why a public hearing had not been held. Ms. Connell responded that the authority generally only holds public hearings on Notices of Intended Action if required by law or requested. She explained that the authority engaged stakeholders in alternative ways rather than through a formal process.

No action taken on ARC 9608C.

## **HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

Representing the agency: Victoria Daniels, Janee Harvey, Kristin Konchalski

ARC 9640C (NOIA), Subsidized Adoption Maintenance Rate Increase, Rule 201.5(6)

Committee members asked whether the moneys appropriated for the daily rate of foster care and adoption were being spent as proposed, or whether there was an update on the spending of moneys. Ms. Konchalski responded that the moneys were being used as proposed according to a subsidy rate set by the department. Members asked what is the dollar amount for the daily rate. She responded that she would provide that information to the committee at a later date.

No action taken on ARC 9640C.

ARC 9641C (NOIA), Student Abuse Reports and Investigations, Ch. 174

Committee members asked about incidents that arose prior to July 1, 2025, but that the department was not made aware of until after the effective date. Ms. Daniels responded that the department may consider adding language to the rulemaking to make it applicable only to incidents arising on or after July 1, 2025.

Members asked how the transfer of responsibilities between the Board of Educational Examiners (BOEE) and the department would work in regard to reports that occurred prior to July 1, 2025, but that the BOEE could no longer investigate under the rulemaking. Ms. Harvey responded that the BOEE had the authority under the rulemaking to address any outstanding reports filed prior to July 1, 2025.

Committee members asked whether the school or a victim of student abuse would be charged with the cost of conducting an investigation. Ms. Harvey responded that the department was able to conduct investigations using the department's existing resources so that no cost would be billed to a school or a victim. Members asked whether the investigation procedures would follow the previous procedures set by the BOEE. She responded that the department handled student abuse investigations differently than child abuse assessments, and noted that the department had met with the Department of Education to establish procedures. She also noted that the department had moved to publish data and outcomes on a public dashboard. Members asked about reported student abuse. She responded that since July 1, 2025, the department had received roughly 100 reports, and had found 20 reports as credible.

Ms. Emily Piper, speaking on behalf of the Iowa Association of School Boards (ISBA), noted that under the rulemaking, if an allegation of student abuse was not found credible, the rulemaking suggested that the department may tell the complainant to file a complaint with the school board. She requested clarifying language for nonactionable reports to ensure that parents understood that a report not found credible by the department may still be credible. She noted that the rulemaking did not clearly define what constituted an act of omission. Ms. Harvey responded that other administrative rules addressed these concerns relating to complaints found not credible by informing the complainants that a different body may address the complaint. She noted that the rulemaking only defined student abuse as physical abuse, sexual abuse, or prostitution.

Committee members asked for clarification on how student abuse differed from child abuse. Ms. Harvey stated that allegations and investigations for student abuse and child abuse are kept separate. She explained that in instances of child abuse, there must be a caretaker, a child, and a category of abuse, but in student abuse, there is not a caretaker but rather any person working for a school. She also explained that child abuse includes 11 different categories of abuse, whereas student abuse includes only 3 categories. She noted that student abuse does not trigger mandatory reporting laws.

Committee members asked how the department had been working with the Department of Education. Ms. Harvey responded that the departments had a cooperative relationship including regular meetings and input from stakeholders.

Committee members asked whether a parent must determine whether to report student abuse to the department or to a school entity, and whether there was a system for a referral between the two. Ms. Harvey responded that it would be too difficult for the department to contact every school board to refer complaints, and instead the department informed parents that if the department cannot provide a remedy, to report the abuse to the school instead. She noted if a parent first reported to a school, the school would contact the department.

Committee members asked what directions were given to complainants with allegations the department determined to be unfounded but who may have allegations with the school. She responded that live intake workers had been trained on screening reports, and, for calls that did not meet the threshold for student abuse, the live intake workers have been instructed to inform the inquirers of the option to bring complaints to the school leadership. She stated she would follow up with additional information on the information provided to complainants by live intake workers.

Committee members asked about the volume of calls received by the 24-hour reporting hotline. Ms. Harvey responded that in a given year, the child abuse hotline, which also received reports of dependent adult abuse and, under the rulemaking, student abuse, received roughly 78,000 calls in 2024. She noted that the department completed roughly 35,000 child abuse assessments per year. Members asked how many employees staffed the hotline. She responded 39 employees.  
No action taken on ARC 9641C.

**PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT**

Representing the agency: Victoria Daniels

ARC 9618C (AF), Concussion or Other Brain Injury Return-To-Play Protocol, Ch. 54

Committee members asked whether the rulemaking was necessary to maintain additional regulatory guidance when the Iowa sports medicine advisory committee had already established protocols. Ms. Daniels responded that a statutory directive required the department to adopt rules. Members stated such a statutory directive could be repealed.

No action taken on ARC 9618C.

**NATURAL RESOURCE COMMISSION**

Representing the agency: Chris Ensminger

ARC 9594C (NOIA), Deer Hunting Licenses, Rules 106.1, 106.7(1), 106.10, 106.12-106.14, 106.16

Committee members asked whether youth deer hunting licenses were available for purchase through the end of the deer hunting season to mirror the regular deer hunting license season. Mr. Ensminger responded that the rulemaking clarified that youth deer hunting licenses could be sold until the last day of the deer hunting season.

No action taken on ARC 9594C.