

Red Tape Review Rule Report (Due: September 1, 2023)

Department Name:	Revenue	Date:	September 1, 2023	Total Rule Count:	1
IAC #:	701	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	277	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	421.14, 422.68, and 423.4
Contact Name:	Alana Stamas	Email:	alana.stamas@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-350-3932

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

The rule describes the Department’s interpretation of the underlying statute to help the public understand the tax refund for biodiesel production.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

To the extent the Department proposes to re-promulgate rules, the Department has determined that the rules aid the public in better understanding the method for claiming and obtaining the tax refund for biodiesel production. The evidence for the benefit of the rule is demonstrated from the text of the rule itself and the greater certainty it provides taxpayers.

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

There is a form to obtain the refund, which the Department provides electronic and paper (if applicable) processes to apply, but there is no fee to submit it. The form is designed to help ensure the public provides the information necessary for the Department to administer the refund.

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

There are no costs to the agency of implementing the rule beyond those that would otherwise be required to administer the statute. There are tax administration expenses associated with administering any tax statute, including return processing and enforcement program work.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

There are no costs of the rules themselves; they are procedural rules required to implement the statute. The statute requires the Department to establish procedures by rule. The cost of inaction would be confusion about the applicability of the refund and the processes by which to obtain it.

Are there less restrictive alternatives to accomplish the benefit? YES NO

If YES, please list alternative(s) and provide analysis of less restrictive alternatives from other states, if applicable. If NO, please explain.

The rules have been revised where possible to rescind statutory text or obsolete language. The rules that will be re-promulgated have been determined to be necessary.

Does this chapter/rule(s) contain language that is obsolete, outdated, inconsistent, redundant, or un-necessary language, including instances where rule language is duplicative of statutory language?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

277.1

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

None.

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

277.1 is being amended to remove redundant and obsolete language.

The text of the proposed rules will be published with the Regulatory Analysis in the Iowa Administrative Code Bulletin in the coming months.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	0
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	115
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	5

ARE THERE ANY STATUTORY CHANGES YOU WOULD RECOMMEND INCLUDING CODIFYING ANY RULES?

No.