

Red Tape Review Rule Report

(Due: September 1, 20 26)

Department Name:	Iowa Racing and Gaming Commission	Date:	7/15/26	Total Rule Count:	7 rules in chapter 13
IAC #:	491	Chapter/ SubChapter/ Rule(s):	13	Iowa Code Section Authorizing Rule:	99F.1, 99F.4, 99F.4B, 99F.7A, 99F.9
Contact Name:	Barb Blake	Email:	Barb.blake@iowa.gov	Phone:	515-281-7355

PLEASE NOTE, THE BOXES BELOW WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE

What is the intended benefit of the rule?

Chapter 13 establishes guidelines and licensing requirements for sports wagering and mobile sports wagering.

Is the benefit being achieved? Please provide evidence.

Chapter 13 is achieving its purpose. There are currently 18 Iowa casinos offering retail sports wagering and 11 licensees offering mobile sports wagering through agreements with brick-and-mortar Iowa casinos. According to data collected and published by the Commission (<https://irgc.iowa.gov/publications-reports/sports-wagering-revenue/archived-sports-revenue>), tax revenue to the State from these operations exceeded \$16.2 million in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2025.

In addition, taxes collected for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2026 have already exceeded the 2025 total.

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

Public compliance costs are minimal to nonexistent. Instead, costs of compliance are borne by the licensees. Their compliance with chapter 13 is a condition of obtaining and maintaining a license to offer sports wagering or advance deposit sports wagering.

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 11 is the personnel cost for staff whose duties include oversight over the relevant areas. This includes personnel stationed at each of the 19 currently-operating casino facilities, as well as staff in Des Moines.

Do the costs justify the benefits achieved? Please explain.

Yes. Chapter 13 sets important regulatory expectations for Iowa's licensed sports wagering operations.

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.

Iowa was among the first states to authorize sports wagering following the Supreme Court's decision in *Murphy v. NCAA*, 584 U.S. 453 (2018). The fact that 18 brick-and-mortar licensees and 11 mobile licensees are maintaining licenses demonstrates that the regulatory approach is not unduly restrictive.

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 are duplicative of statutory language. These are proposed for removal. Some other language in chapter 13 that duplicates a statute has either been proposed for elimination or reduced to refer plainly back to the statute.

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

13.2(7)(a)—duplicative of statute, propose simply referencing the applicable Code section
13.2(7)(d)—duplicative of statute, propose simply referencing the applicable Code section
13.7(5)—redundant, can be consolidated

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

All other rules in chapter 13.

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

METRICS

Total number of rules repealed:	2 subparagraphs
Proposed word count reduction after repeal and/or re-promulgation	630 (7342 current count; 6712 after repeal and re-promulgation)
Proposed number of restrictive terms eliminated after repeal and/or re-promulgation	38 "shall"; 1 "must"; 4 "require"

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

None related to chapter 13.