Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2026)

| | | | - / - / | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|----------|
| Department | Public Safety | Date: | 7/15/2026 | Total Rule | 6 |
| Name: | | | | Count: | |
| | 661 | Chapter/ | 15 | Iowa Code | 693.7 |
| IAC #: | | SubChapter/ | | Section | |
| | | Rule(s): | | Authorizing | |
| | | | | Rule: | |
| Contact Name: | Josie Wagler | Email: | wagler@dps.state.ia.us | Phone: | 515-725- |
| | | | | | 6185 |

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The intended benefit of this rule is to establish a Law Enforcement Administrator's Telecommunications Advisory Committee (LEATAC), outline committee membership makeup and terms of appointment, and provide duties of the committee and members.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

The benefit is no longer being achieved. LEATAC no longer exists, and the Law Enforcement Administrator's (LEA) Communication Network frequency was removed. It was replaced by the Iowa Statewide Interoperable Communications System (ISICS) and ISICS Board, governed by Chapter 600 of the DPS's administrative rules. Those entities and that chapter supplanted chapter 15 and the need therefor.

What are the costs incurred by the public to comply with the rule?

No costs are currently incurred by the public to comply with this rule.

What are the costs to the agency or any other agency to implement/enforce the rule?

There are no costs to the department or any other agency to implement this rule.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

While there are no costs associated with this rule, the benefit is no longer being achieved due to LEATAC no longer existing.

Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit? If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.

Not applicable.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or unnecessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language? [list chapter/rule number(s) that fall under any of the above categories]

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

Yes, the entire chapter is outdated and obsolete.

RULES PROPOSED FOR REPEAL (list rule number[s]):

The Department proposes Chapter 15 be repealed in its entirety.

RULES PROPOSED FOR RE-PROMULGATION (list rule number[s] or include rule text if available):

The Department proposes repealing Chapter 15 in its entirety.

*For rules being re-promulgated with changes, you may attach a document with suggested changes.

METRICS

| Total number of rules repealed: | 6 |
|---|-----|
| Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 757 |
| Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation | 13 |

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES? No.