

Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 2026)

Department Name:	Iowa Racing and Gaming Commission	Date:	10/7/25	Total Rule Count:	7 rules in chapter 10
IAC #:	491	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	10	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	99D.7, 99D.8A, 99D.9, 99D.9B, 99D.10, 99D.11, 99D.22, 99D.23, 99D.25, 99D.25A
Contact Name:	David Ranscht or Barb Blake	Email:	david.ranscht0@iowa.gov or barb.blake@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-218-7701 or 515-281-7355

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

IRGC promulgated chapter 10 to regulate the personnel involved in, and conduct of, thoroughbred and quarter horse racing in Iowa. Among other things, the chapter establishes parameters for the track and facilities; establishes conduct guidelines for jockeys, practicing veterinarians, trainers, and other personnel; and sets detailed guidelines for other aspects of racing, such as the process for claiming horses in a claiming race. Close regulation aims to ensure the integrity of the sport and of each individual race while protecting the safety both of horses and of people involved in racing.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Chapter 10 is achieving its purposes. IRGC obtained a detailed study and report from a third-party consultant in August 2024 (available on the IRGC website at <https://irgc.iowa.gov/publications-reports/analyses-reports-and-studies>). Although that study identified some challenges facing the Iowa horse racing industry (such as declining field size in thoroughbred races and lower foal crops in Iowa), it also opined that Iowa's purses are mostly competitive in the Mid-America Race Region (apart from a few tracks in other states) and did not suggest there is any major integrity concern with Iowa's racing industry.

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

The costs incurred by the general public to comply with chapter 10 are minimal to nonexistent. Those who wish to participate in racing in Iowa must pay a licensing fee under chapter 6. Some incidental costs may also be incurred—for example, to ensure that only authorized substances and medications are obtained, possessed, and administered to horses.

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

The primary agency cost to implement and enforce chapter 10 is personnel costs, either through paid IRGC employees (such as stewards) or through contracted services. For example, under Iowa Code section 99D.23(1) and (2), IRGC contracts with Racetrack Veterinarians of Iowa, LLC to provide commission veterinarians, and contracts with Industrial Laboratories to test bodily fluid and hair samples from horses.

In addition, thoroughbred racing is subject to shared oversight with the federal Horseracing Integrity and Safety Authority (HISA). HISA also incurs costs and expenses to enforce its regulations. HISA itemizes these costs yearly, and assesses them proportionally to each state conducting covered thoroughbred racing, based on the level of racing in that state. The federal regulations may preempt provisions in Iowa's chapter 491—10 to the extent chapter 10 is less stringent than the federal standard.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

The costs justify the benefits. Although HISA's federal costs are proportionally assessed to Iowa and other horse racing jurisdictions, these assessments are not paid from the Iowa general fund. Since HISA began federal oversight, its state assessments have been paid by both racetrack licensees and other covered personnel in Iowa. Starting in 2026, the assessments will be paid in part from those sources and in part from a new Iowa horse racing fund under Iowa Code section 99D.27B.

In addition, over the last decade, the fatality rate for horses in Iowa has regularly registered beneath the national average fatality rate for horse racing. This indicates that a major goal of chapter 10—maintaining animal safety—is being achieved.

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.

HISA sets a uniform federal standard for thoroughbred racing. One option would be to fully adopt the HISA standards in Iowa. That would significantly reduce the word count in chapter 10 and therefore qualify as less restrictive. However, it is not a realistic option for three reasons.

First, HISA only oversees thoroughbred racing. Iowa also authorizes quarter horse racing, which is not subject to HISA oversight and can require differing standards. Thus, it is better to maintain Iowa-specific rules so that the unique nature of quarter horse racing is acknowledged.

Second, HISA's regulations may not fully cover every subject. Thus, it is useful to maintain Iowa-specific rules as potential gap-filling provisions. Even so, the proposed re-promulgation of chapter 10 adopts several specific HISA regulations in a few particular areas.

Third, HISA is subject to ongoing litigation seeking to invalidate the legislation creating HISA (the Horseracing Integrity and Safety Act, also abbreviated HISA) and thereby discontinue federal oversight. Maintaining an Iowa-specific rule chapter, even with some references to HISA standards, would allow IRGC easily to resume all regulation if HISA is later invalidated or repealed.

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

Some definitions of specific terms are either duplicative of statutory language or unnecessary to define separately. These are proposed for removal.

Some subrules or subparagraphs were rescinded in prior rulemaking, but have not been removed from the chapter. These placeholders are now obsolete or outdated and can be removed, with the rest of the chapter renumbered appropriately.

In addition, some rule language is obsolete, outdated, duplicative, or redundant. These examples are listed below. Some of the rules can be consolidated into other, existing rules. Some of the rules are proposed to be eliminated in favor of adopting the federal HISA standard. Still others are proposed for deletion entirely.

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

10.2(6)(a) and (b)—unnecessary level of detail, can be condensed to eliminate subparagraphs
10.2(9)—unnecessary / outdated, propose adopting a uniform federal standard
10.2(10)—unnecessary / outdated, propose adopting a uniform federal standard
10.4(2)(a)—duplicative of statute
10.4(2)(e)—duplicative of statute
10.4(5)(i)(4)—previously rescinded, can be removed from chapter
10.4(17)(i)—previously rescinded can be removed from chapter
10.5(2)(d)—previously rescinded, can be removed from chapter
10.5(2)(n)—redundant, can be consolidated into existing 10.5(2)(p)
10.5(2)(s)—previously rescinded, can be removed from chapter
10.6(1)(b)(15)—redundant, can be consolidated into existing 10.6(1)(b)(7)
10.6(12)—previously rescinded, can be removed from chapter
10.7(2)(b)—duplicative, can be consolidated into existing 10.2(7)

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

All other rules in chapter 10, but organized differently.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:

14 subrules or
subparagraphs

Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	1207 (26,630 current word count; 25,423 after repeal and re- promulgation)
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	328 “shall”; 14 “must”; 1 “require”; 3 “prohibit”

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

None related to chapter 10.