

THE ADMINISTRATIVE RULES REVIEW COMMITTEE

2012 Annual Report

I. INTRODUCTION - State Administrative Agencies

The rulemaking process of Iowa Code chapter 17A only applies to executive branch state agencies and the Citizens' Aide. Accordingly, other agencies housed within either the legislative or judicial branches of state government are not considered in this report.

Iowa Code chapter 7E refers to departments, divisions within departments, independent agencies, and separate constitutional offices; however, there is no overarching structure to Iowa state government. As a practical matter, it is best to define an "agency" as a policy-making body and ignore statutory designations. Using this broad definition there are 125 executive branch administrative agencies: 21 umbrella departments, 46 semi-autonomous divisions, bureaus, and entities within those departments, 27 licensing boards, 26 independent agencies, and 4 separate constitutional offices. The Governor as an individual is excluded from this list because the state's chief executive is exempt from the rulemaking process; however, any agency housed within that office is subject to the rulemaking process.

II. OVERVIEW OF 2012 RULEMAKING

This report covers the final rulemaking actions in calendar year 2012, published in the Iowa Administrative Bulletin from January through December 2012. The Administrative Rules Review Committee ("Committee") *generally* reviews rules published the month previous to the Committee's monthly meeting. Accordingly, this publication period covers the Committee's February 2011 meeting through its January 2012 meeting.

In 2012, rule adoptions declined by 15%; in 2011 the level of rulemaking had declined by 25%. 56 agencies adopting 264 filings. The 2012 filings are detailed by agency and by month in Appendix A. As always, the Department of Human Services leads the list with 40 filings (down from 88 filings in 2010 and 55 filings in 2011). 32 of these 56 agencies adopted only one or two filings.

Rulemaking filings generally contain more than a single rule change. The 264 filings actually represent about 1000 individual rule additions, amendments, or repeals. Rulemaking activity for the last 10 years is as follows:

YEAR	AGENCIES	FILINGS	YEAR	AGENCIES	FILINGS
2012	56	264	2007	51	446
2011	56	310	2006	58	440
2010	52	427	2005	54	396
2009	56	473	2004	56	420
2008	52	468	2003	54	435

In 2012, 9 agencies adopted 21 filings using the "emergency" rulemaking provisions of the rulemaking process (Iowa Code §§ 17A.4 and 17A.5). This number is significant decrease from the 113 emergency filings in 2010 or the 60 filings in 2012. Virtually all of the emergency filings were "double barreled", i.e., published as a notice of intended action at the same time the notice of emergency rulemaking is published. In 2012, emergency rulemaking filings account for only 8 percent of the total filings. The 10-year history for emergency rulemaking is as follows:

YEAR	EMERGENCY	FILINGS	YEAR	EMERGENCY	FILINGS
2012	21 (8 percent)	264	2007	93 (21 percent)	446
2011	60 (18 percent)	310	2006	65 (14 percent)	440
2010	113 (26 percent)	427	2005	72 (18 percent)	394
2009	100 (21 percent)	473	2004	59 (14 percent)	420
2008	98 (21 percent)	468	2003	73 (17 percent)	435

To calculate the volume of rulemaking, only *filed* documents are counted, either through the normal process or through emergency rulemaking. Individual rule changes contained within each document are not counted. If notices were included, the volume of rulemaking would virtually double. Each filing put into effect contains one or more individual rule changes; on the average each filing contains approximately four individual changes. The 2012 rulemaking filings are broken down by month on the top line of the following chart, which tracks previous years:

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	TOTAL
2012	18	24	13	21	14	6	22	20	15	50	27	34	264
2011	16	26	15	26	26	28	21	25	27	25	47	28	310
2010	30	35	34	42	40	44	23	35	39	22	41	42	427
2009	32	32	27	31	33	36	85	28	46	36	38	49	473
2008	51	20	10	30	17	26	98	31	34	40	49	62	468
2007	36	33	14	26	25	30	38	80	26	62	32	44	446
2006	26	54	41	27	39	32	51	39	11	59	35	26	440
2005	23	39	15	09	23	33	80	32	24	19	54	45	396
2004	28	32	39	28	27	34	41	20	67	33	43	28	420
2003	20	41	39	23	31	25	38	44	35	48	38	53	435
2002	39	52	43	45	56	33	32	52	57	49	35	30	523
2001	34	44	23	31	43	19	36	23	34	60	21	51	419
2000	19	29	22	28	22	34	23	38	34	56	45	17	367
1999	14	51	29	26	111	45	35	29	44	33	28	61	506

III. 2012 FORMAL ARRC ACTIONS

The number of formal actions taken by the Committee has remained at a steady level. No objections were imposed in 2012, a level similar to the previous five years. Two session delays were imposed and four 70-day delays were imposed. The Committee also approved eight general referrals.

FEBRUARY 2012

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE DIVISION-ARC 9972B, deferred judgments.
70 DAY DELAY

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT-ARC 9959B, payment adjustment for physician services.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

MARCH 2012

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT-ARC 0012C, 0013C, 0014C, 0016C, delayed review.
REVIEW POSTPONED UNTIL APRIL..

PROFESSIONAL LICENSURE DIVISION-ARC 0022C, 0024C, deferred judgments.
70 DAY DELAY

JUNE 2012

SECRETARY OF STATE- ARC 0109C, special elections to fill a vacancy in the office of representative of Congress.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

AUGUST 2012

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT- ARC 0187C, rest area and highway helper sponsorship programs.
70 DAY DELAY.

SEPTEMBER 2012

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT- ARC 0187C, rest area and highway helper sponsorship programs.
SESSION DELAY.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT-**special review**, 18.44 and 226.17, which pertain to the sale of farm machinery and equipment.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

OCTOBER 2012

REVENUE DEPARTMENT- ARC 0361C, geothermal heat pump and solar energy system tax credits.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT- ARC 0327C, at-will employees.
[1986] OBJECTION LIFTED.

NOVEMBER 2012

REVENUE DEPARTMENT- ARC 0403C, inputs used in taxable vehicle wash and wax services.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

DECEMBER 2012

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT- ARC 460C, at-will employees.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

SECRETARY OF STATE- ARC 464C, mechanics' notice and lien registry.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

JANUARY 2013

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT-ARC 0510C, high school equivalency diploma.
GENERAL REFERRAL.

INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS DEPARTMENT-ARC 0484C, tuberculosis (TB) screening for health care workers.
70 DAY DELAY

**PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT-ARC 0483C, electronic vital records system.
SESSION DELAY.**

IV. MAJOR ITEMS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT, *Confidential employees 11/14/12 IAB, ARC 0460C, ADOPTED.*

Background. Code §8A.412 provides that a confidential employee is exempt from the merit employment system; it is one of 24 legislatively created exceptions to the application of the merit system. In 2011 the Department proposed to expand the definition of the term “confidential employee” to include state employees who work in personnel offices. That proposal was dropped and in the Fall of 2012 the Department adopted an alternative proposal which defines a confidential employee as an employee who is in a confidential relationship with a director, chief deputy administrative officer, a division administrator, or a similar position, and is a part of the management or legal team of that top-level administrator.

Commentary. Department representatives stated that confidential status would be determined on an agency-by-agency basis, in consultation with agency heads. Affected personnel would not include labor contract covered positions. The representatives noted that in the cases of the Administrative Services Department, about three percent of the positions would be affected.

Opponents contended that any expansion of the statutory term should be done through the legislative process, not rulemaking. Opponents also questioned the need for the rule, since no problems with the current administration were presented. Opponents also protested that the application of the rule was vague and lacked standards.

Committee members were split in their deliberations. Some members were concerned over the potential impact the rule might have on the merit system. Other members felt that the concerns were overstated and that the rule would be limited in its application.

Action. General referral.

SECRETARY OF STATE, *Noncitizen registered voter identification and removal process, 8/8/12 IAB, EMERGENCY.*

Background. The Secretary of State has emergency implemented a process to determine whether non-citizens have improperly registered to vote. Under this process the state registrar will periodically obtain lists, from a federal or state agency, of foreign nationals who are residing in Iowa. The list will be matched against the voter registration records to determine likely matches based on predetermined search criteria.

Commentary. Using existing information the Secretary determined that over 3,000 foreign nationals had registered to vote, although more up-to-date information was required before any action could be taken. The Secretary is seeking access to a federal data base which would allow investigators to match voter registration with citizenship. In response to a Committee question the Secretary stated that an investigator was being paid using federal HAVA (Help America Vote Act) funds.

The Secretary stated that individuals would be initially contacted with a simple inquiry concerning voter eligibility and a request for more information. If no response is

made a more forceful communication would follow. The Secretary stated a due process hearing would precede any final action.

Some Committee members argued that there was no real evidence that a problem existed and questioned whether a foreign national would risk a felony in order to vote. A member stated that such a program, if needed, should be enacted through the legislative process, not through rulemaking. Members also questioned the need for an “emergency” filing, since action could not now be taken before the November elections.

Members of the public spoke against the new procedures; speakers questioned both the need and the statutory authority for the program. Speakers noted that the program could intimidate naturalized citizens from registering to vote, noting that many immigrants fear any interaction with government, based on their earlier experiences.

Action. No action taken.

SECRETARY OF STATE, *Mechanics Liens 11/28/12 IAB, ARC 0464C, ADOPTED.*

Background. 2012 Iowa Acts, House File 675, as amended by 2012 Iowa Acts, House File 2465, creates an on-line central state registry for mechanics liens, effective January 2nd, 2013. The intent was to make the process transparent to buyers, sellers and all contractors. The mechanics’ notice and lien registry provides a listing of all persons or companies furnishing labor or materials who have posted a lien or who may post a lien upon the improved property. A general contractor for residential construction who fails to post a notice of commencement of work on the registry within ten days following commencement of work is not entitled to a lien or other remedies. The procedure is similar to that currently in place for the Uniform Commercial Code.

Commentary. The notice requirements identify the possibility that a lien could, in the future, be filed for work or materials that had not been paid for by the contractor. Thus the buyer of a property is forewarned of this potential problem. At issue is that a contractor who uses neither subcontractors nor suppliers must still file a notice. Stakeholders contended this placed an unnecessary burden on these contractors and questioned whether it was supported by statutory authority. Committee members expressed a willingness to delay this portion of the rule; however, agency representatives warned that such a delay would impact the entire program of registration and notice. The agency representatives agreed to seek legislative action on this matter and during that time to NOT require registration by a contractor using neither subcontractors nor suppliers.

Action. General referral. 2013 Acts, HF 565 made various changes to the registry.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, *Driver’s license: deferred action for childhood arrivals, informal discussion.*

Background. In a June 15, 2012 memo the federal Department of Homeland Security announced that it would defer removal actions on certain aliens who had been brought to the United States as children and who have lived in the United States for at least five years. The memo specifically stated: “This memorandum confers no substantive right, immigration status or pathway to citizenship.”

In interpreting the impact of this memorandum, the Iowa Department of Transportation determined in December 2012 that it did not confer any legal status on

these individuals and for that reason could not be granted a driver's license. A Department memorandum stated that under Iowa Code §§321.182, 321.190, and 321.196, a driver's license could only be issued to a foreign national "authorized to be present" in the United States. The Department noted that the federal memorandum did not grant any such authorization. Department representatives stated that Iowa law would need to be changed to allow these individuals to obtain a driver's license.

Commentary. This issue came before the Committee at its January 2013 meeting, but there was no actual rule to review. Committee members questioned why this policy had not been promulgated as a rule. Department representatives contended that there was no new policy, and that the federal memo did not affect existing policy. Some members disagreed and contended that Department action simply made it more difficult for these individuals to obtain an education or find employment. Members noted that some individuals had been issued license's prior to the December announcement and now the Department was taking action to revoke those licenses.

Public commenters noted that the deferred action came with specific criteria, requiring that the individual be under 30 and either be in school, have graduated school, or be a veteran. The individual could also have no significant criminal record. Public comment supported granting drivers licenses to these individuals.

Action. This was an issue review by the Committee, and no formal action was available. In 2013 the federal government clarified that deferred action status was adequate to support the issuance of a driver's license.

TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT, *Rest area and highway helper sponsorship programs; competition with private enterprise, 07/11/12 IAB, ARC 0187C, ADOPTED.*

Background. The department adopts two new clean-up programs for rest stops and highways. The rest area sponsorship program allows a person, a firm, or an entity to sponsor a rest area by providing a monetary contribution, in exchange for an acknowledgment sign on the main-traveled way of an interstate highway and an interior sign within the primary rest area building. The sponsors will provide the sign, which must measure 24 inches high and 48 inches wide. The department shall review the acknowledgment sign proposed by the sponsor; the acknowledgment will not contain an advertisement or a partisan endorsement.

The highway helper sponsorship program allows a person, a firm, or an entity to provide a monetary contribution to assisting in the funding of that service, in exchange for an acknowledgment sign on the main-traveled way of an interstate highway patrolled by the highway helper vehicles.

At the Committee's August meeting, members expressed concern about the state granting more naming rights to state resources than it already has, and how far such a trend might go. Members also expressed concern about whether sponsors inappropriate for such a setting might win a bid, and whether there might be free speech implications in denying such bids. A motion for a 70-day delay of this rulemaking carried. The Committee requested further review at the September meeting.

Commentary. A representative from the department responded to questions raised by the Committee at its August meeting. On the issue of potentially controversial sponsors, the representative explained that the Attorney General is satisfied with the

language currently in the rulemaking and that new language had been added to the RFP for these programs specifying that the signage cannot contain political endorsements or statements that may have an “adverse effect” on the state. Similar language has been used before in a highway context. The Attorney General has asked the department to avoid any language prohibiting “offensive” material, as that may raise questions regarding the First Amendment. The representative stated that signage from issue advocacy groups would most likely be acceptable. However, groups would need to certify that they do not discriminate, which could prove problematic for a group such as the Boy Scouts. The representative noted that legal challenges may arise no matter what standards the department sets.

Members asked if the legislature had authorized participation in these programs, and the representative said it had not. Members asked if funds from these programs had been earmarked yet, and the representative said no, although they would be used for roads. Members asked if out-of-state sponsors could participate, and the representative said yes. Members asked if a legislator could be a sponsor in a non-election year, or if that would violate the prohibition on political endorsements. The representative was unsure. Members expressed discomfort with the programs in general, and particularly with respect to who might or might not be able to become a sponsor. A motion was made for a session delay of these rules, which will delay the effective date of the rules until the adjournment of the 2013 General Assembly. The motion carried.

Action. Session delay.

PAROLE BOARD, *Voting requirements*, 10/31/12 IAB, ARC 0421C, ADOPTED.

Background. Code §904A.4 states that the board shall interview and consider inmates for parole and work release. The statute provides that a majority vote of the members is required to grant a parole or work release. The board is made up of two full-time members and three part-time members. Board procedures provide for inmate interviews by three member panels, following various types of evaluation.

This rulemaking revises the board’s risk assessment tool used for making releasing decisions for paroles and work releases. Previously, a risk assessment score of one through six required three affirmative votes for a release, a score of seven or eight required four affirmative votes, and a score of nine required all five members to cast an affirmative vote to grant a release. This rulemaking rescinds the language tying a specific risk assessment score to the number of affirmative votes needed for a parole or work release. The amendments also change the requirement that four or five affirmative votes are needed to release certain high-risk inmates. With these changes, three affirmative votes are the most required for release of any single inmate.

Commentary. A representative of the board explained the rulemaking. He explained that the board is moving away from using a single method of risk assessment for inmates. New methods of risk assessment have been implemented and will be in place when the rulemaking becomes effective. The representative confirmed that these new risk assessments are not a part of this rulemaking, and the current risk assessment will still be used as well.

Committee members repeatedly asked if the changes amount to loosening the requirements to achieve parole. The representative responded that while the number of

votes needed to parole higher risk inmates will be decreased, the reason for this rulemaking is to comply with the new risk assessment methods and to reduce the lag time between parole decisions and actual time of release. He also explained that requiring more than three votes was an initial policy position when the current risk assessment was still being implemented. Now that the board has better assessment methods, requiring more votes is no longer necessary. Some committee members questioned whether removing lag time is an adequate reason to pursue this rulemaking; others felt this would improve the decision-making process. Committee members asked how risk assessment scores are determined. The representative explained that it is done via computer scoring which takes account of various factors such as criminal history and taking classes while incarcerated.

A representative of the Governor's Office explained that the current risk assessment system is outdated and that the scoring methodology described in the current rule is outdated and ineffective. He also explained that only three members of the board are ever present at board meetings. When an inmate requires more than three votes for a decision to be reached, a delay occurs until the other members vote, and they must work off meeting notes rather than live experience. He also noted that there is not a specific statutory basis for requiring more than three votes for a parole decision. He stated that this rulemaking does not represent any danger to public safety and promotes efficiency in the parole and work release process.

The chairperson of the board stated that new evaluations provided greater security that an inmate was an appropriate candidate for parole. The chairperson also stated that in over 99 percent of the cases the decisions are unanimous. The chairperson noted that the three-member vote was set out in the statute itself and that under the current process two of the voting members do not participate in the interview. In response to concerns expressed by committee members, the chairperson assured the committee the reviews will remain thorough, and the standards will remain high.

One public commenter expressed support for the rulemaking, stating it would add more human discretion to these decisions rather than relying on questionable scoring methodology alone and suggesting this rule would save money and would not result in more inmates being released. Several other members of the public expressed concern that the new rules would make parole easier to attain and would return dangerous criminals to the streets.

Action. No action taken. 2013 Acts, HF 538 established a pool of three alternate board members.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, *Preprofessional skills test for admission to teacher preparation programs; subject assessments for teacher candidates*, 11/28/12 IAB, ARC 0476C, ADOPTED.

Background. This rulemaking implements 2012 Iowa Acts, SF 2284, section 39, relating to pretesting of candidates for admission to teacher preparation programs. Whereas, presently teacher preparation programs are required to administer a "basic skills test" to admission candidates, the new legislation requires that the test be "a preprofessional skills test offered by a nationally recognized testing service." The new legislation also imposes a new requirement that, prior to completion of the program, each student in a teacher preparation program achieve scores above the 25th percentile nationally on an assessment that measures pedagogy and knowledge of at least one

subject area. The department has designated the Praxis II tests to meet this requirement. The rulemaking is effective January 2, 2013.

At the Committee's September meeting, Committee members expressed concern that the January 2 effective date for the rule will unfairly impact students who will be undergoing testing soon, but after that date, and who have not had adequate time or training to prepare for the new standard. The department director replied that the effective date of the underlying legislation required him not to delay its implementation. Public comment has been received echoing the concerns raised at the September meeting.

Commentary. A representative of the department summarized the rulemaking, and the department director discussed some additional matters. The director explained that another testing option which would satisfy the requirements of SF 2284, the edTPA test, would be available in fall 2013, and the department would implement that option by rule at that time. The director reviewed the department's process for this rulemaking, noting that the department had sought substantial stakeholder input over the last five months and made changes in response to concerns that had been raised. In response to concerns that the rulemaking would unfairly impact students who will be testing soon, the director stated that because the underlying legislation did not have a delayed effective date, the department should have implemented the new standards months earlier, but had waited in order to accommodate students testing in the fall and to receive further feedback. He noted that other parts of SF2284 had later effective dates, while these testing requirements did not.

Public comment was received from a member of the state Board of Education and the former Massachusetts education commissioner, who expressed support for the rulemaking, and from the former director of assessment at UNI, who urged a delay in implementation for the sake of fairness to current students. Committee members sought clarification as to some of the technical aspects of the new tests. Some members shared the concern about the impact of the January 2 effective date on current students, but otherwise expressed support for the rulemaking. They noted that the effective date issue could be addressed in the next session of the General Assembly. Other members suggested that the 25th percentile threshold is too low.

Action. No action taken.

APPENDIX A—SUMMARY OF RULEMAKING IN 2012

Agency name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Tot
HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT[441]	07	03	02	02			06	01	03	12		04	40
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT[281]		05		02							02	11	20
REVENUE AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT[701]	01			01	01			02	02	08	03	01	19
PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT[641]				05						04	05	04	18
SECRETARY OF STATE[721]	03	01	01	02	01			03			01		12
Professional Licensure Division[645]	01	02	01	02			02			01	01	01	11
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT[761]	01	01	03		01		01	01	01	01		01	11
Pharmacy Examiners Board[657]				01				02		03		04	10
AGRICULTURE AND LAND STEWARDSHIP DEPARTMENT[21]	01			01	02		01			02		01	08

Environmental Protection Commission[567]			01		01		01	02	02			01	08
Iowa Finance Authority[265]		01				02		01		03		01	08
Educational Examiners Board[282]			02								05		07
Natural Resource Commission[571]					01		02		02	02			07
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT [261]		03									03		06
Medicine Board[653]	01						03					02	06
College Student Aid Commission[283]					01			01		03			05
Labor Services Division[875]	01							01	02	01			05
Alcoholic Beverages Division[185]							01	02		01			04
Ethics & Campaign Disclosure Bd[351]		04											04
PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT[661]		01			01		02						04
Engineering & Land Surveying Bd[193C]										02	01		03
Insurance Division[191]	01		01		01								03
Regents [681]	01		01			01							03
Soil Conservation Division[27]							01		01		01		03
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT [11]										01	01		02
Dental Examiners Board[650]								01			01		02
Historical Division[223]								02					02
Homeland Security And Emergency Management Division[605]					01				01				02
INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS DEPARTMENT[481]					01							01	02
Nursing Board[655]			02										02
Accountancy Examining Board[193]										01			011
Aging, Department On[17]												01	01
AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY[25]		01											01
ATTORNEY GENERAL [61]									01				01
Banking Division[187]							01						01
BLIND, DEPARTMENT FOR THE[111]											01		01
Capital Investment Board [123]				01									01
Early Childhood Iowa State Board[249]						01							01
Interior Design Examining Board[193g]								01					01
IPERS [495]		01											01
Landscape Architectural Examining Board[193d]							01						01
Management Department[541]						01							01
Parole Board[205]										01			01
PERB[621]										01			01
Racing and Gaming Commission[491]		01											01
Real Estate Appraisers Board [193F]										01			01
Real Estate Commission[193E]										01			01
School Budget Review Committee[289]				01									01
State Public Defender [493]					01								01

Telecommunications & Technology [751]											01			01
TREASURER [781]				01								01		02
Utilities Division[199]			01											01
VETERANS AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF[801]					01									01
Volunteer Service, Iowa Commission on[817]												01		01
Voter Registration Commission[821]													1	1
Workers' Compensation Division[876]						1								1
TOTAL	18	24	13	21	14	6	22	20	15	50	27	34	264	

APPENDIX B—EMERGENCY RULEMAKING IN 2012

Agency name	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Total
SECRETARY OF STATE[721]		01	01	02	01			02					07
HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT[441]	01	01						02		01			05
Iowa Finance Authority[265]		01				01		01					03
Aging, Department On[17]												01	01
AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY[25]	01												01
Capital Investment Board [123]				01									01
Natural Resource Commission[571]					01								01
Real Estate Commission[193E]										01			01
Soil Conservation Division[27]									01				01
TOTAL	02	03	01	03	02	01	00	05	01	02	00	01	21

APPENDIX C: IOWA AGENCIES

The Reorganization Act of 1986 (Iowa Code Chapter 7E) established most of Iowa's state agencies in a number of umbrella departments, with divisions, bureaus, sections, and units as subunits of a department. In addition to these departments, a variety of independent agencies are also established. Iowa Code chapter 7E defines a variety of agencies which include:

- An authority which is a body with independent power to issue and sell bonds.
- A board which has policymaking powers and the power to hear contested cases.
- A commission which has rulemaking powers.
- A committee which is appointed to study a specific problem and terminate on the completion of its assignment.
- A council which is an advisory body.
- A licensing board which sets standards of professional competence and conduct for a profession or occupation under its supervision.

ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES DEPARTMENT[11]
AGING, DEPARTMENT ON[17]
AGRICULTURE AND LAND STEWARDSHIP DEPARTMENT[21]
Agricultural Development Authority[25]

Soil Conservation Division[27]
ATTORNEY GENERAL[61]
AUDITOR OF STATE[81]
BEEF INDUSTRY COUNCIL, IOWA[101]
BLIND, DEPARTMENT FOR THE[111]

CAPITAL INVESTMENT BOARD, IOWA[123]
CITIZENS' AIDE[141]
CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION[161]
COMMERCE DEPARTMENT[181]
Alcoholic Beverages Division[185]
Banking Division[187]
Credit Union Division[189]
Insurance Division[191]
Professional Licensing and Regulation Bureau[193]
Accountancy Examining Board[193A]
Architectural Examining Board[193B]
Engineering and Land Surveying Examining Board[193C]
Landscape Architectural Examining Board[193D]
Real Estate Commission[193E]
Real Estate Appraiser Examining Board[193F]
Interior Design Examining Board[193G]
Savings and Loan Division[197]
Utilities Division[199]
CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT[201]
Parole Board[205]
CULTURAL AFFAIRS DEPARTMENT[221]
Arts Division[222]
Historical Division[223]
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, IOWA DEPARTMENT OF[261]
City Development Board[263]
IOWA FINANCE AUTHORITY[265]
EDUCATION DEPARTMENT[281]
Educational Examiners Board[282]
College Student Aid Commission[283]
Higher Education Loan Authority[284]
Iowa Advance Funding Authority[285]
Libraries and Information Services Division[286]
Public Broadcasting Division[288]
School Budget Review Committee[289]
EGG COUNCIL, IOWA[301]
EMPOWERMENT BOARD, IOWA[349]
ENERGY INDEPENDENCE, OFFICE OF[350]
ETHICS AND CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE BOARD, IOWA[351]
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL[361]
FAIR BOARD[371]
HUMAN RIGHTS DEPARTMENT[421]
Community Action Agencies Division[427]
Criminal and Juvenile Justice Planning Division[428]
Deaf Services Division[429]
Persons With Disabilities Division[431]
Latino Affairs Division[433]
Status of African-Americans, Division on the[434]
Status of Women Division[435]
Status of Iowans of Asian and Pacific Islander Heritage[436]
HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT[441]
INSPECTIONS AND APPEALS DEPARTMENT[481]
Employment Appeal Board[486]
Foster Care Review Board[489]
Racing and Gaming Commission[491]
State Public Defender[493]

IOWA PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM[495]
LAW ENFORCEMENT ACADEMY[501]
LIVESTOCK HEALTH ADVISORY COUNCIL[521]
LOTTERY AUTHORITY, IOWA[531]
MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT[541]
Appeal Board, State[543]
City Finance Committee[545]
County Finance Committee[547]
NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT[561]
Energy and Geological Resources Division[565]
Environmental Protection Commission[567]
Natural Resource Commission[571]
Preserves, State Advisory Board for[575]
PETROLEUM UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK FUND BOARD, IOWA COMPREHENSIVE[591]
PREVENTION OF DISABILITIES POLICY COUNCIL[597]
PROPANE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH COUNCIL, IOWA[599]
PUBLIC DEFENSE DEPARTMENT[601]
Homeland Security and Emergency Management Division[605]
Military Division[611]
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS BOARD[621]
PUBLIC HEALTH DEPARTMENT[641]
Professional Licensure Division[645]
Dental Board[650]
Medicine Board[653]
Nursing Board[655]
Pharmacy Board[657]
PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT[661]
RECORDS COMMISSION[671]
REGENTS BOARD[681]
Archaeologist[685]
REVENUE DEPARTMENT[701]
SECRETARY OF STATE[721]
SHEEP AND WOOL PROMOTION BOARD, IOWA[741]
TELECOMMUNICATIONS AND TECHNOLOGY COMMISSION, IOWA[751]
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT[761]
TREASURER OF STATE[781]
TURKEY MARKETING COUNCIL, IOWA[787]
UNIFORM STATE LAWS COMMISSION[791]
VETERANS AFFAIRS, IA DEPARTMENT of[801]
VETERINARY MEDICINE BOARD[811]
VOLUNTEER SERVICE, IOWA COMMISSION ON[817]
VOTER REGISTRATION COMMISSION[821]
WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT[871]
Labor Services Division[875]
Workers' Compensation Division[876]
Workforce Development Board and Workforce Development Center Administration Division[877]