

**EIGHTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
2015 REGULAR SESSION
DAILY
HOUSE CLIP SHEET**

APRIL 21, 2015

HOUSE FILE 632

H-1238

1 Amend House File 632 as follows:
2 1. Page 5, after line 31 by inserting:
3 <Sec. ____ . Section 505.26, Code 2015, is amended by
4 adding the following new subsection:
5 NEW SUBSECTION. 7. a. If a health carrier or
6 pharmacy benefits manager fails to use or accept the
7 prior authorization form that has been approved for
8 use by the health carrier or pharmacy benefits manager
9 pursuant to this section, or to respond to a health
10 care provider's request for prior authorization of
11 prescription drug benefits within seventy-two hours of
12 the health care provider's submission of the form, the
13 request for prior authorization shall be considered to
14 be approved.
15 b. However, if the prior authorization request is
16 incomplete or additional information is required, the
17 health carrier or pharmacy benefits manager may request
18 the additional information within the seventy-two-hour
19 period and once the additional information is submitted
20 the provisions of paragraph "a" shall again apply.
21 c. Notwithstanding paragraphs "a" and "b", the
22 commissioner may develop, by rule, minimum time periods
23 for a health carrier or pharmacy benefits manager to
24 respond to a health care provider's request for prior
25 authorization of prescription drug benefits or for
26 additional information, that are less than, but in no
27 case exceed seventy-two hours, as the commissioner
28 deems appropriate under the circumstances.>
29 2. By renumbering as necessary.

By L. MILLER of Scott

H-1238 FILED APRIL 20, 2015

SENATE FILE 482

H-1239

1 Amend Senate File 482, as amended, passed, and
2 reprinted by the Senate, as follows:

3 1. By striking page 23, line 35, through page 24,
4 line 5.

5 2. Page 24, line 6, by striking <d.> and inserting
6 c.>

7 3. Page 42, by striking lines 15 through 19 and
8 inserting:

9 <4. "Sports betting pool" or "pool" means a game
10 in which the participants select a square on a grid
11 corresponding to numbers on two intersecting sides of
12 the grid and winners are determined by whether the
13 square selected corresponds to numbers relating to an
14 athletic event in the manner prescribed by the rules
15 of the game.>

16 4. Page 43, after line 32 by inserting:

17 <m. A person shall not participate in any wager,
18 bet, or pool which relates to an athletic event
19 or contest and which is authorized or sponsored by
20 one or more schools, educational institutions, or
21 interscholastic athletic organizations, if the person
22 is a coach, official, player, or contestant in the
23 athletic event or contest.>

24 5. By renumbering as necessary.

By BACON of Story

H-1239 FILED APRIL 20, 2015



HF 643 – Model Rural Hub and Spoke Recycling Program (LSB2564HZ)
Analyst: Debra Kozel (Phone: (515) 281-6767) (deb.kozel@legis.iowa.gov)
Fiscal Note Version – New

Description

House File 643 transfers up to \$100,000 in FY 2016 from the Solid Waste Account in the Groundwater Protection Fund to the Waste Reduction Center at the University of Northern Iowa (UNI) to conduct a study to develop a Hub and Spoke Recycling Program for Iowa. The Bill specifies what the study will include and requires the Center to submit a preliminary report with findings to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) by December 31, 2015, and a final report by July 1, 2016.

Background

The Hub and Spoke Recycling Program has been implemented in other states:

- **Colorado** has a hub and spoke recycling model that has centralized processing centers or hubs in larger cities where the materials are sorted and sold. Surrounding communities bring their recyclables to the hub.
- **New Mexico** began a hub and spoke program in 2010 with federal grant money from the Department of Energy. The hubs invested in capital equipment and infrastructure necessary to process and store recycled materials that can be sold to remanufacturing markets. The spoke communities invested in collection trailers or containers that can be easily transported to the recycling hub.
- **Tennessee** is in the beginning stages of a hub and spoke program. Currently the Tennessee Division of Solid Waste Management is asking for a proposal to establish facilities for processing and collecting recyclable materials from multiple local governments.

Fiscal Impact

The estimated fiscal impact is a one-time allocation of up to \$100,000 in FY 2016 from the Solid Waste Account of the Groundwater Protection Fund.

Source

Department of Natural Resources

/s/ Holly M. Lyons

April 16, 2015

The fiscal note for this bill was prepared pursuant to **Joint Rule 17** and the Iowa Code. Data used in developing this fiscal note is available from the Fiscal Services Division of the Legislative Services Agency upon request.



HF 646 – Physical Plant and Equipment Levy Uses (LSB2247HZ)
Analyst: John Parker (Phone: (515) 725-2249) (john.parker@legis.iowa.gov)
Fiscal Note Version – New

Description

House File 646 expands the authorized use of Physical Plant and Equipment Levy (PPEL) revenues to include expenses incurred in the repair of transportation equipment if the cost of the repair exceeds \$2,500.

Background

Regular PPEL: In FY 2015, 328 school districts (97.0% of the 338 districts) levied for the regular PPEL (approved by the school board) totaling \$49.4 million. Of those 328 districts, 322 levied up to the regular PPEL capacity. The remaining 16 districts have a remaining PPEL capacity totaling \$1.4 million.

Voter-Approved PPEL (VPPEL): In FY 2015, 244 school districts (72.2%) levied for the VPPEL totaling \$119.4 million (includes \$108.5 million in property tax and \$10.9 million in income surtax). Of those 244 districts, 99 levied up to the VPPEL capacity. The remaining 239 districts have a remaining VPPEL capacity totaling \$87.0 million.

Assumptions

- School boards not currently levying their capacity for the regular PPEL (maximum rate of \$0.33/\$1,000 of assessed valuation) may approve an increase in the regular PPEL rate.
- There may be an impact related to the voter-approved PPEL levy rate as well. However, the amount will depend on voter approval within each school district.
- If voters within a school district have approved a revenue purpose statement that grants Secure an Advanced Vision for Education (SAVE) funds to be used for PPEL purposes, those SAVE funds may be used for the purposes specified in **HF 646**.

Fiscal Impact

There is no impact to the State General Fund. The estimated local government fiscal impact is unknown. Based on data for FY 2015, the maximum fiscal impact will be an increase in the regular PPEL of \$1.4 million. Additionally, there may be an increase in the voter-approved PPEL in future fiscal years, but any increases will depend on the voter approval within each district.

Sources

Iowa Department of Management, School Aid file
LSA analysis and calculations

/s/ Holly M. Lyons

April 16, 2015

The fiscal note for this bill was prepared pursuant to **Joint Rule 17** and the Iowa Code. Data used in developing this fiscal note is available from the Fiscal Services Division of the Legislative Services Agency upon request.
