Wildlife, Parks, and Tourism Commission

Notice of Public Hearing

A public hearing will be conducted by the Wildlife, Parks, and Tourism Commission at 6:30 p.m., Thursday, June 17, 2021 at the Great Plains Nature Center, 6232 E. 29th Street North, Wichita, Kansas to consider the approval and adoption of the proposed regulations of the Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks, and Tourism.

A general discussion and workshop meeting on the business of the Wildlife, Parks, and Tourism Commission will begin at 1:00 p.m., June 17 at the location listed above. The meeting will recess at approximately 5:00 p.m. and then resume at 6:30 p.m. at the same location for the regulatory hearing and more business. There will be public comment periods at the beginning of the afternoon and evening meeting for any issues not on the agenda and additional comment periods will be available during the meeting on agenda items. Old and new business may also be discussed at this time. If necessary to complete business matters, the Commission will reconvene at 9:00 a.m. June 18 at the location listed above.

Any individual with a disability may request accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting and may request the meeting materials in an accessible format. Requests for accommodation to participate in the meeting should be made at least five working days in advance of the meeting by contacting Sheila Kemmis, Commission Secretary, at (620) 672-5911. Persons with a hearing impairment may call the Kansas Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing at 1-800-432-0698 to request special accommodations.

This 60-day notice period prior to the hearing constitutes a public comment period for the purpose of receiving written public comments on the proposed administrative regulations.

All interested parties may submit written comments prior to the hearing to the Chairman of the Commission, Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks, and Tourism, 1020 S. Kansas Ave., Suite 200, Topeka, KS 66612 or to sheila.kemmis@ks.gov if electronically. All interested parties will be given a reasonable opportunity at the hearing to express their views orally in regard to the adoption of the proposed regulations. During the hearing, all written and oral comments submitted by interested parties will be considered by the commission as a basis for approving, amending and approving, or rejecting the proposed regulations.

The regulations that will be heard during the regulatory hearing portion of the meeting are as follows:

**K.A.R. 115-3-1.** This permanent regulation sets legal equipment, taking methods and possession for game birds. The proposed changes would clean up unnecessary language due to a regulation review.

**Economic Impact Summary:** No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

**K.A.R. 115-4-4.** This permanent regulation sets legal equipment and taking methods for
big game. The proposed amendments would allow for the use of blaze orange garments upon the head instead of a hat during firearms deer and elk seasons.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

K.A.R. 115-8-1. This permanent regulation sets hunting, furharvesting and discharge of firearms restrictions on various department lands and waters. This proposed amendment to the regulation would update the reference document in relation to hunting, fishing and furharvesting restrictions on various department lands and waters.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

K.A.R. 115-25-1. This exempt regulation sets the open seasons, bag limit and possession limit for prairie chickens. The proposed version of the regulation would allow for a continuous season for prairie chickens, rather than split seasons.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

K.A.R. 115-25-1a. This exempt regulation sets the open seasons, bag limit and possession limit for quail. The proposed version of the regulation would allow for youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

K.A.R. 115-25-1b. This exempt regulation sets the open seasons, bag limit and possession limit for pheasant. The proposed version of the regulation would allow for youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.

K.A.R. 115-25-9a. This exempt regulation sets the open seasons, bag limit and possession limit for deer on military subunits. This proposed version of the regulation sets deer seasons on military installations in the state and adjusts the dates from the previous season.

Economic Impact Summary: No substantial negative economic impact to the department, other state agencies, small businesses, or individual members of the public is anticipated.
Copies of the complete text of each regulation and its respective economic impact statement may be obtained by writing the chairman of the Commission at the address above, electronically on the department’s website at ksoutdoors.com, or by calling (785) 296-2281.

Gerald Lauber, Chairman
115-3-1. Game birds; legal equipment, taking methods, and possession. (a) Legal hunting equipment for game birds shall consist of the following:

(1) Shotguns and muzzleloading shotguns not larger than 10 gauge and using only shot;
(2) archery equipment; and
(3) falconry equipment; and
(4) other equipment or methods as allowed by permit.

(b) The use of dogs, horses, and mules shall be permitted while hunting, but no person shall shoot while mounted on a horse or mule.

(c) Hunting hours shall be from 1/2 one-half hour before sunrise to sunset.

(d) Game birds shall be shot only while the birds are in flight.

(e) Any type of apparel may be worn while taking game birds.

(f) Legally taken game birds may be possessed without limit in time and may be given to another if accompanied by a dated written notice that includes the donor’s printed name, signature, address, and permit or license number. The person receiving the meat shall retain the notice until the meat is consumed, given to another, or otherwise disposed of. It shall not be deemed unlawful for a person to relinquish possession of a game bird for the purpose of dressing the bird.

(g) Pheasants Each pheasant in an individual’s possession for the purpose of transportation shall retain intact a foot, or plumage, or some part by which the sex can be readily established. (Authorized by and implementing K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-807 and K.S.A. 32-1002; effective, T-115-7-27-89, July 27, 1989; effective Sept. 18, 1989; amended June 1, 2001; amended P-__________.)
115-4-4. Big game; legal equipment and taking methods. (a) Hunting equipment for the taking of big game during a big game archery season shall consist of the following:

(1) Archery equipment.

(A) No bow or arrow shall have any electronic device attached to the bow or arrow that controls the flight of the arrow. Devices that may be attached to a bow or arrow shall include lighted pin, dot, or holographic sights; illuminated nocks; rangefinders; film or video cameras; locking draws; and radio-frequency location devices.

(B) Each arrow used for hunting shall be equipped with a broadhead point incapable of passing through a ring with a diameter of three-quarters of an inch when fully expanded. A big game hunter using archery equipment may possess non-broadhead-tipped arrows while hunting if the arrows are not used to take or attempt to take big game animals.

(2) Crossbows using arrows that are equipped with broadhead points incapable of passing through a ring with a diameter of three-quarters of an inch when fully expanded.

(A) A big game hunter using crossbow equipment may possess non-broadhead-tipped arrows while hunting if the arrows are not used to take or attempt to take big game animals.

(B) No crossbow or arrow shall have any electronic device attached to the crossbow or arrow that controls the flight of the arrow. Devices that may be attached to a crossbow or arrow shall include lighted pin, dot, or holographic sights; illuminated nocks; rangefinders; film or video cameras; and radio-frequency location devices.

(b) Hunting equipment for the taking of big game during a big game muzzleloader-only season shall consist of the following:

(1) Archery and crossbow equipment as authorized in subsection (a); and
(2) muzzleloading rifles, pistols, and muskets that can be loaded only through the front of the firing chamber with separate components and are .40 inches in diameter bore or larger. Only tumble-on-impact, hard-cast solid lead, conical lead, or saboted bullets shall be used with muzzleloading rifles, pistols, and muskets.

(c) Hunting equipment for the taking of big game during a big game firearm season shall consist of the following:

(1) Archery and crossbow equipment as authorized in subsection (a);

(2) muzzleloader-only season equipment as authorized in subsection (b);

(3) centerfire rifles and handguns that are not fully automatic, while using only tumble-on-impact, hard-cast solid lead, soft point, hollow point, or other expanding bullets; and

(4) shotguns using only slugs.

(d)(1) Each individual hunting deer or elk during a firearms deer or elk season and each individual assisting an individual hunting deer or elk as authorized by K.A.R. 115-4-2 or K.A.R. 115-18-15 during a firearms deer or elk season shall wear outer clothing of a bright orange color commonly referred to as daylight fluorescent orange, hunter orange, blaze orange, or safety orange. This bright orange color shall be worn as follows:

(A) A hat or other garment upon the head with the exterior of not less than 50 percent of the bright orange color, an equal portion of which is visible from all directions; and

(B) at least 100 square inches of the bright orange color that is on the front of the torso and is visible from the front and at least 100 square inches that is on the rear of the torso and is visible from the rear.

(2) Lures, decoys except live decoys, and nonelectric calls shall be legal while hunting big
(3) Any individual may use blinds and stands while hunting big game.

(4) Optical scopes or sights that project no visible light toward the target and do not electronically amplify visible light or detect infrared light or thermal energy may be used.

(5) Any range-finding device, if the device does not project visible light toward the target, may be used.

(6) Devices capable of dispensing lethal, debilitating, or immobilizing chemicals to take big game animals shall not be used.

(e) Shooting hours for deer, antelope, and elk during each day of any deer, antelope, or elk hunting season shall be from one-half hour before sunrise to one-half hour after sunset.

(f) Horses and mules may be used while hunting big game, except that horses and mules shall not be used for herding or driving big game.

(g) Firearm report-suppressing devices may be used.

(h) Handguns may be possessed during all big game seasons. However, no handgun shall be used to take deer except as legal equipment specified in subsection (c) during a big game firearms season.

(i) Dogs may be used to retrieve dead or wounded big game animals if the following requirements are met:

1. Each dog shall be maintained on a handheld leash at all times while tracking the big game animal.

2. An individual tracking big game animals outside of legal shooting hours shall not carry any equipment capable of harvesting the big game animal.
(3) Each individual harvesting a big game animal shall be limited to the equipment type for the permit and the season that is authorized.

(4) Each individual participating in the tracking of the big game animal shall have a hunting license, unless the individual is exempt by law or regulation. (Authorized by and implementing K.S.A. 2019 2020 Supp. 32-807 and K.S.A. 2019 2020 Supp. 32-937; effective June 1, 2001; amended April 19, 2002; amended April 22, 2005; amended June 2, 2006; amended April 13, 2007; amended April 11, 2008; amended May 21, 2010; amended April 20, 2012; amended April 19, 2013; amended Sept. 4, 2014; amended April 26, 2019; amended May 22, 2020; amended P-________.)
115-8-1. Department lands and waters: hunting, furharvesting, and discharge of firearms. (a) Subject to provisions and restrictions as established by posted notice or as specified in the document adopted by reference in subsection (e), the following activities shall be allowed on department lands and waters:

(1) Hunting during open seasons for hunting on lands and waters designated for public hunting;

(2) furharvesting during open seasons for furharvesting on lands and waters designated for public hunting and other lands and waters as designated by the department;

(3) target practice in areas designated as open for target practice; and

(4) noncommercial training of hunting dogs.

(b) Other than as part of an activity under subsection (a), the discharge of firearms and other sport hunting equipment capable of launching projectiles shall be allowed on department lands and waters only as specifically authorized in writing by the department.

(c) The discharge of fully automatic rifles or fully automatic handguns on department lands and waters shall be prohibited.

(d) Department lands and waters shall be open neither for commercial rabbit and hare furharvesting nor for commercial harvest of amphibians and reptiles.

115-25-1. Prairie chickens; open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits; permit. (a) East unit. The open season for the taking of prairie chickens shall be September 15 through January 31 of the following year, in that part of Kansas bounded by a line from the Colorado-Kansas state line east on interstate highway I-70 to its junction with state highway K-24, then east on state highway K-24 to its junction with state highway K-18, then southeast on state highway K-18 to its junction with federal highway US-183, then south on federal highway US-183 to its junction with state highway K-156, then east on state highway K-156 to its junction with state highway K-19, then south on state highway K-19 to its junction with federal highway US-50, then east on federal highway US-50 to its junction with federal highway US-281, then south on federal highway US-281 to its junction with the Oklahoma-Kansas state line, then east along the Oklahoma-Kansas state line to its junction with the Missouri-Kansas state line, then north along the Missouri-Kansas state line to its junction with the Nebraska-Kansas state line, then west along the Nebraska-Kansas state line to its junction with the Colorado-Kansas state line, and then south along the Colorado-Kansas state line to its junction with interstate highway I-70.

(b) Southwest unit. There shall be no open season for the taking of prairie chickens in that part of Kansas bounded by a line from the Colorado-Kansas state line east on interstate highway I-70 to its junction with state highway K-24, then east on state highway K-24 to its junction with state highway K-18, then southeast on state highway K-18 to its junction with federal highway US-183, then south on federal highway US-183 to its junction with state highway K-156, then east on state highway K-156 to its junction with state highway K-19, then south on state highway K-19 to its junction with federal highway US-50, then east on federal highway US-50 to its junction with federal highway US-281, then south on federal highway US-281 to its junction with the Oklahoma-Kansas state line, then west along
the Oklahoma-Kansas state line to its junction with the Colorado-Kansas state line, and then north along
the Colorado-Kansas state line to its junction with interstate highway I-70.

(c) Daily bag limit. The daily bag limit shall be two prairie chickens in units with an open
season for the taking of prairie chickens.

(d) Possession limit. The possession limit shall be eight prairie chickens.

(e) Permit required. Before taking any prairie chickens, the individual shall have obtained and
shall possess, while hunting, a current prairie chicken hunting permit from the department. (Authorized
by and implementing K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-807.)
115-25-1a. Quail; open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits. (a) The open season for the taking of quail shall be the second Saturday in November through January 31 of the following year.

(b) The youth season for the taking of quail shall begin on the first Saturday in November and shall continue for two consecutive days, including the opening day. Only a person who is 17 years of age or younger and who is accompanied by an adult 18 years of age or older may hunt during the youth season for the taking of quail.

(c) The entire state shall be open for the taking of quail.

(d) (1) The daily bag limit during the open season for the taking of quail shall be eight quail.

(2) The daily bag limit during the youth season for the taking of quail shall be four quail.

(e) (1) The possession limit during the open season for the taking of quail shall be 32 quail.

(2) The possession limit during the youth season for the taking of quail shall be eight quail.

This regulation shall be effective on and after August 1, 2021. (Authorized by and implementing K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-807.)
115-25-1b. **Pheasants; open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits.** (a) The open season for the taking of cock pheasants shall be the second Saturday in November through January 31 of the following year.

(b) The youth season for the taking of cock pheasants shall begin on the first Saturday in November and shall continue for two consecutive days, including the opening day. Only a person who is 17 years of age or younger and who is accompanied by an adult 18 years of age or older may hunt during the youth season for the taking of cock pheasants.

(c) The entire state shall be open for the taking of cock pheasants.

(d) (1) The daily bag limit during the open season for the taking of cock pheasants shall be four cock pheasants.

(2) The daily bag limit during the youth season for the taking of cock pheasants shall be two cock pheasants.

(e) (1) The possession limit during the open season for the taking of cock pheasants shall be 16 cock pheasants.

(2) The possession limit during the youth season for the taking of cock pheasants shall be four cock pheasants.

This regulation shall be effective on and after August 1, 2021. (Authorized by and implementing K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-807.)
115-25-9a. Deer; open season, bag limit, and permits; additional considerations; military subunits.  (a) In addition to the season for designated persons specified in K.A.R. 115-25-9, in the Fort Riley subunit the season for designated persons shall also be October 9, 2021 through October 11, 2021.

   (b) In the Fort Riley subunit, the open firearm season for the taking of deer shall be November 26, 2021 through November 28, 2021, December 18, 2021 through December 23, 2021, and December 26, 2021 through December 28, 2021.

   (c) In addition to the archery season specified in K.A.R. 115-25-9, the open archery season for the taking of deer in the Fort Riley subunit shall be September 1, 2021 through September 12, 2021 and January 1, 2022 through January 31, 2022 by individuals who possess the required authorization issued by Fort Riley to hunt for deer during the specified days.

   (d) In the Fort Riley subunit, the pre-rut white-tailed deer antlerless-only season specified in K.A.R. 115-25-9 shall be closed.

   (e) In the Fort Riley subunit, the extended firearms season for the taking of antlerless-only white-tailed deer shall be closed.

   (f) In the Fort Leavenworth subunit, the open firearm season for the taking of deer shall be November 13, 2021 through November 14, 2021; November 20, 2021 through November 21, 2021; November 25, 2021 through November 28, 2021; December 4, 2021 through December 5, 2021; and December 11, 2021 through December 12, 2021.

   (g) In the Fort Leavenworth subunit, the extended firearms season for the taking of antlerless-only white-tailed deer shall be January 1, 2022 through January 23, 2022.

   (h) In the Fort Leavenworth subunit, the extended archery season for the taking of
antlerless-only white-tailed deer shall be January 24, 2022 through January 31, 2022.

(i) In the Smokey Hill subunit, the open firearm season for the taking of deer shall be December 1, 2021 through December 12, 2021. Four additional antlerless white-tailed deer permits shall be valid in unit 4a.

This regulation shall have no force and effect on and after March 1, 2022. (Authorized by and implementing K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-807 and K.S.A. 2020 Supp. 32-937.)
Kansas Administrative Regulations
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For the Kansas Division of the Budget
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K.A.R. 115-3-1
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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 regulation sets legal equipment, taking methods and possession for game birds. The proposed changes would clean up unnecessary language due to a regulation review.

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, Missouri and Colorado all have varying regulations dealing with upland bird seasons and 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 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 would not impact specific businesses, sectors, public utility ratepayers, individuals or local governments.

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 version of the regulation cleans up unnecessary language.
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.

None.

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.

None.

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.

None

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 held public hearings on this regulation on January 14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearing on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

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 regulation deals with legal equipment for hunting big game. The proposed amendment to the regulation would allow the use headgear other than a hat.

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 legal equipment for big game.

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 amendments 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 amendments 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 to allowing a garment on the head other than a hat would be more inclusive when considering recruitment of new hunters and retention of current hunters.
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. This proposal provides an alternative equipment choice for personal use in big game hunting.

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. This proposal provides an alternative equipment choice for personal use in big game hunting.

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 held public hearings on this regulation on January 14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearing on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

This proposed amendments to the regulation would update the reference document in relation to hunting, fishing and furharvesting restrictions on various department lands and waters.

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 land use.

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 amendments 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 amendments would not have implementation and compliance costs.

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 regulation currently has restrictions on certain uses of department lands and waters. The regulation updates changes in management of those properties.
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 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 held will hold a public hearings on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

This regulation sets the open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits for prairie chickens. The proposed version of the regulation would allow hunting of prairie chickens from Sept 15 to January 31.

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. Nebraska and Colorado have a prairie chicken season. Oklahoma and Missouri do not. Colorado’s season runs October 1 to January 3 and Nebraska’s season runs September 1 to January 31.

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 would not impact specific businesses, sectors, public utility ratepayers, individuals or local governments.

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

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

The proposed version of the regulation would allow the prairie chicken season to run from September 15 to January 31.

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.

None.

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.

None.

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.

Licensure is already required to hunt for prairie chickens. The proposed version of the regulation merely allows for more hunting days and opportunity. Approximately 5,387 prairie chicken hunting permits were sold in 2020 at $2.50 per permit.

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 ☒

Prairie chicken hunting is a subset of small game hunting. Small game hunting requires a general hunting license and prairie chicken hunting also requires a prairie chicken hunting permit. Big game hunting requires a permit for the species to be hunted as well as a general hunting license. As a result, the agency cannot determine the economic impact of the sale of hunting licenses specifically used to hunt prairie chickens because of the overlap of pheasant, quail and prairie chicken hunting. However, based on the sales of the prairie chicken hunting permit, if those purchasing the permit solely hunted prairie chickens, the economic impact of prairie chicken hunting...
alone would be $2,542,664 to the Kansas economy, based on data contained in a report published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service every five years. Further, based on 2020 hunting license sales, the agency sold approximately 156,236 general hunting licenses of all categories, both resident and nonresident, generating approximately $9,209,640.00, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund. The sale of small game hunting licenses generates an additional $73,743,392.00 for the Kansas economy, based on data contained in a report published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service every five years. The agency held public hearings on this regulation on January 14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearings on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

This regulation sets the open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits for quail. The proposed version of the regulation would allow youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season.

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, Missouri and Colorado all have varying regulations dealing with upland bird seasons and 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 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 would not impact specific businesses, sectors, public utility ratepayers, individuals or local governments.

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 version of the regulation would allow youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season in an effort to encourage...
participation and standardize youth seasons across all youth seasons.

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.

None.

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.

None.

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.

16 and 17 year-old youths already require a hunting license to participate in the youth upland season as the age of licensure is 16. The proposed version of the regulation is merely allowing another year of participation in the youth season.

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 ☒

Quail hunting is a subset of small game hunting. Small game hunting requires a general hunting license. Big game hunting requires a permit for the species to be hunted as well as a general hunting license. As a result, the agency cannot determine the economic impact of the sale of hunting licenses specifically used to hunt quail. However, based on 2020 hunting license sales, the agency sold approximately 156,236 general hunting licenses of all categories, both resident and nonresident, generating approximately $9,209,640.00, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund. The sale of small game hunting licenses generates an additional $73,743,392.00 for the Kansas economy, based on data contained in a report published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service every five years. The agency held public hearings on this regulation on January
14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearings on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

KDWPT Christopher J Tymeson 785-296-1032
Agency Contact
K.A.R. Number(s)
K.A.R. 115-25-1b
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 regulation sets the open seasons, bag limits, and possession limits for pheasants. The proposed
version of the regulation would allow youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season.

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, Missouri and Colorado all have varying
regulations dealing with upland bird seasons and 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 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 would not impact specific businesses, sectors, public
utility ratepayers, individuals or local governments.

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 version of the regulation would allow youths 17 and under to hunt in the youth season in an effort to encourage
participation and standardize youth seasons across all youth seasons.

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.

None.

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.

None.

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.

16 and 17 year-old youths already require a hunting license to participate in the youth upland season as the age of licensure is 16. The proposed version of the regulation is merely allowing another year of participation in the youth season.

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 ☑

Pheasant hunting is a subset of small game hunting. Small game hunting requires a general hunting license. Big game hunting requires a permit for the species to be hunted as well as a general hunting license. As a result, the agency cannot determine the economic impact of the sale of hunting licenses specifically used to hunt pheasants. However, based on 2020 hunting license sales, the agency sold approximately 156,236 general hunting licenses of all categories, both resident and nonresident, generating approximately $9,209,640.00, all of which accrues to the wildlife fee fund. The sale of small game hunting licenses generates an additional $73,743,392.00 for the Kansas economy, based on data contained in a report published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service every five years. The agency held public hearings on this regulation on January
14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearings on March 25, April 29 and June 17.

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

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 deer seasons on military installations in the state and adjusts the dates from the previous season.

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 deer seasons.

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 amendments 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 amendments would have an economic effect on businesses surrounding the military installations and individuals who purchase permits to hunt deer on those installations. However, any economic impact would be included in K.A.R. 115-25-9, statewide deer seasons because permits are not available specifically for military installations and it is impossible to estimate the number of participants.

C. Businesses that would be directly affected by the proposed rule and regulation;
Any business that sells products or services to deer hunters, including sporting goods retailers, outfitters, grocery stores, service stations, hotels, etc.
D. Benefits of the proposed rule(s) and regulation(s) compared to the costs;
If there were no regulation and no deer season, there would be lost collateral economic impact to the state and deer numbers would increase, thereby causing negative human wildlife interactions.

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 costs associated with this proposal. Any data is included in the general deer regulation, K.A.R. 115-25-9.

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. Any data is included in the general deer regulation, K.A.R. 115-25-9.

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. Any data is included in the general deer regulation, K.A.R. 115-25-9.

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. Any data and methodology is included in the general deer regulation, K.A.R. 115-25-9.

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 held public hearings on this regulation on November 19, attended by 24 members of the public, on January 14, attended by 52 members of the public and will hold a public hearings on March 25, April 29, and June 17.
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.