1

Regulatory Analysis

Notice of Intended Action to be published: Iowa Administrative Code 571—Chapter 74 "Forest Land Enhancement Program (FLEP)"

Iowa Code section(s) or chapter(s) authorizing rulemaking: 456A.24 State or federal law(s) implemented by the rulemaking: Iowa Code section 456A.24(13)

Public Hearing

A public hearing at which persons may present their views orally will be held via conference call as follows. Persons who wish to attend the conference call should contact Jeff Goerndt via email. A conference call number will be provided prior to the hearing. Persons who wish to make oral comments at the conference call public hearing must submit a request to Jeff Goerndt prior to the hearing to facilitate an orderly hearing.

September 25, 2024 1 p.m.

Via video/conference call

Public Comment

Any interested person may submit written comments concerning this Regulatory Analysis. Written comments in response to this Regulatory Analysis must be received by the Department of Natural Resources (Department) no later than 4:30 p.m. on the date of the public hearing. Comments should be directed to:

Jeff Goerndt Iowa Department of Natural Resources 6200 Park Avenue, Suite 200 Des Moines, Iowa 50321

Email: jeff.goerndt@dnr.iowa.gov

Purpose and Summary

Chapter 74 defines procedures by which federal, state, or private moneys designated for forestry cost-share practices on private lands may be utilized for those purposes. This chapter is unnecessary. The Department can utilize funds for these purposes under the authority provided by Iowa Code sections 455A.13(1) and 456A.24(13). Therefore, consistent with Executive Order 10 (2023), this chapter is proposed to be rescinded.

Analysis of Impact

- 1. Persons affected by the proposed rulemaking:
- Classes of persons that will bear the costs of the proposed rulemaking:

No costs are associated with this rulemaking.

• Classes of persons that will benefit from the proposed rulemaking:

Not applicable.

- 2. Impact of the proposed rulemaking, economic or otherwise, including the nature and amount of all the different kinds of costs that would be incurred:
 - Quantitative description of impact:

This chapter is being rescinded and will not be replaced.

• Qualitative description of impact:

Rescinding this chapter will remove unnecessary regulations.

- 3. Costs to the State:
- Implementation and enforcement costs borne by the agency or any other agency:

None.

• Anticipated effect on state revenues:

None.

4. Comparison of the costs and benefits of the proposed rulemaking to the costs and benefits of inaction:

There is no cost related to the proposed rulemaking, and any benefits of the rescinded chapter are maintained through other existing laws.

5. Determination whether less costly methods or less intrusive methods exist for achieving the purpose of the proposed rulemaking:

Rescinding this chapter is the least costly and intrusive option.

- 6. Alternative methods considered by the agency:
- Description of any alternative methods that were seriously considered by the agency:

The Department considered repromulgating the existing chapter.

• Reasons why alternative methods were rejected in favor of the proposed rulemaking:

The benefits of this chapter are already accomplished under Iowa Code provisions, and therefore, this chapter was determined to be unnecessary.

Small Business Impact

If the rulemaking will have a substantial impact on small business, include a discussion of whether it would be feasible and practicable to do any of the following to reduce the impact of the rulemaking on small business:

- Establish less stringent compliance or reporting requirements in the rulemaking for small business.
- Establish less stringent schedules or deadlines in the rulemaking for compliance or reporting requirements for small business.
- Consolidate or simplify the rulemaking's compliance or reporting requirements for small business.
- Establish performance standards to replace design or operational standards in the rulemaking for small business.
 - Exempt small business from any or all requirements of the rulemaking.

If legal and feasible, how does the rulemaking use a method discussed above to reduce the substantial impact on small business?

This rulemaking has no impact on small business.

Text of Proposed Rulemaking

ITEM 1. Rescind and reserve 571—Chapter 74.