

115-18-7. This regulation shall be revoked on and after January 1, 2021. (Authorized by K.S.A. 32-807, as amended by L. 2012, Ch. 47, Sec. 25, K.S.A. 2011 Supp. 32-919, as amended by L. 2012, Ch. 154, Sec. 5, and K.S.A. 2011 Supp. 32-932, as amended by L. 2012, Ch. 47, Sec. 48; implementing K.S.A. 2011 Supp. 32-932, as amended by L. 2012, Ch. 47, Sec. 48; effective Oct. 30, 1989; amended, T-115-9-9-97, Sept. 9, 1997; amended Dec. 29, 1997; amended Oct. 1, 1999; amended April 19, 2002; amended Feb. 18, 2005; amended April 11, 2008; amended May 21, 2010; amended April 19, 2013; revoked P-\_\_\_\_\_.)

APPROVED

AUG 17 2020

DIVISION OF THE BUDGET

APPROVED

AUG 18 2020

DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATION

APPROVED

SEP 04 2020

ATTORNEY GENERAL

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

KDWPT  
Agency

Christopher J Tymeson  
Agency Contact

785-296-1032  
Contact Phone Number

K.A.R. 115-18-7  
K.A.R. Number(s)

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 permanent regulation provides for use of crossbows and locking draws for big game and wild turkey hunting by persons with disabilities. The regulation is proposed for revocation as the equipment types the regulation allows for persons with disabilities are allowed generally now.

**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. Missouri, Oklahoma, Nebraska and Colorado all have varying regulations dealing with big game legal equipment.

**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 revocation will neither enhance nor 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 revocation will have no negative economic effect on any sector.

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

None.

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

The proposed benefits include removing an unnecessary regulation.



**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 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.**

There are no implementation or compliance costs with this proposal.

**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.**

There are no implementation or compliance costs with this proposal.

**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.**

There are no implementation or compliance costs with this proposal.

**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

The agency will hold hearings on August 20 virtually, September 25 in Topeka, and November 19 in Oakley.

**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 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.

