

**Kansas Administrative Regulations
Economic Impact Statement
For the Kansas Division of the Budget**

KDWPT
Agency

K.A.R. 115-25-8
K.A.R. Number(s)

Christopher J Tymeson
Agency Contact

785-296-1032
Contact Phone Number

Submit a hard copy of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) and any external documents that the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) would adopt, along with the following to:

Division of the Budget
900 SW Jackson, Room 504-N
Topeka, KS 66612

I. Brief description of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s).

This proposed version of the regulation sets the seasons for elk hunting in Kansas.

II. Statement by the agency if the rule(s) and regulation(s) is mandated by the federal government and a statement if approach chosen to address the policy issue is different from that utilized by agencies of contiguous states or the federal government. (*If the approach is different, then include a statement of why the Kansas rule and regulation proposed is different*)

This is not a federal mandate. Oklahoma, Nebraska and Colorado all have varying regulations dealing with elk hunting seasons and requirements. Missouri does not currently have an elk season. The season structure is the same as last season and draw permit numbers are the same as last season.

III. Agency analysis specifically addressing following:

A. The extent to which the rule(s) and regulation(s) will enhance or restrict business activities and growth;

The proposed version of the regulation will not enhance or restrict business activities and growth.

B. The economic effect, including a detailed quantification of implementation and compliance costs, on the specific businesses, sectors, public utility ratepayers, individuals, and local governments that would be affected by the proposed rule and regulation and on the state economy as a whole;

The proposed version of the regulation could have a collateral positive economic impact on grocery stores, hotels and motels, outfitters, service stations, etc.

C. Businesses that would be directly affected by the proposed rule and regulation;

Outfitters or landowners.

D. Benefits of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) compared to the costs;

The proposed version of the regulation establishes an elk season. Without the regulation, elk populations will rise and negative

DOB APPROVAL STAMP

human-wildlife conflicts will occur. Additionally, the corresponding positive economic impact to Kansas would not occur without the season.

- E. Measures taken by the agency to minimize the cost and impact of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) on business and economic development within the State of Kansas, local government, and individuals;**

There are no negative costs and impacts on businesses associated with this proposal.

- F. An estimate, expressed as a total dollar figure, of the total annual implementation and compliance costs that are reasonably expected to be incurred by or passed along to business, local governments, or members of the public.**

The sale of elk hunting permits to the public generates approximately \$17,000 to the agency, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund, based on 2018 permit sales.

An estimate, expressed as a total dollar figure, of the total implementation and compliance costs that are reasonably expected to be incurred by or passed along to business, local governments, or members of the public.

The sale of elk hunting permits to the public generates approximately \$17,000 to the agency, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund, based on 2018 permit sales.

Do the above total implementation and compliance costs exceed \$3.0 million over any two-year period?

YES NO

Give a detailed statement of the data and methodology used in estimating the above cost estimate.

The total number of elk hunting permits 97 in 2018. This generates approximately \$17,000 for the agency, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund, and is paid by user fees. Additionally, each individually identifiable elk hunter (97) goes 11 days afield per year and spends approximately \$1616 per year, generating \$156,752 for the Kansas economy, based on economic studies provided by the USFWS.

Prior to the submission or resubmission of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s), did the agency hold a public hearing if the total implementation and compliance costs exceed \$3.0 million over any two-year period to find that the estimated costs have been accurately determined and are necessary for achieving legislative intent? If applicable, document when the public hearing was held, those in attendance, and any pertinent information from the hearing.

YES NO

- G. If the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) increases or decreases revenues of cities, counties or school districts, or imposes functions or responsibilities on cities, counties or school districts that will increase expenditures or fiscal liability, describe how the state agency consulted with the League of Kansas**

DOB APPROVAL STAMP

Municipalities, Kansas Association of Counties, and/or the Kansas Association of School Boards.

Not applicable.

- H. Describe how the agency consulted and solicited information from businesses, associations, local governments, state agencies, or institutions and members of the public that may be affected by the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s).**

News releases to every newspaper in the state, discussion at prior public hearings and meetings which are broadcast online, publication in the Kansas Register and publication on the Department's website.

- I. For environmental rule(s) and regulation(s) describe the costs that would likely accrue if the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) are not adopted, as well as the persons would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).**

Not applicable.

DOB APPROVAL STAMP