

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-1

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The proposed amendments to this regulation, which defines the terms used in “Article 4 – Motor Carriers of Persons and Property,” includes the removal of certain definitions to prevent variation from the federal definitions. Additionally there are edits to reflect minor grammatical and form corrections and recent updates to Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration (FMCSA) regulations. The proposed amendments are not anticipated to have an economic impact.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 changes in this regulation affect definitions used elsewhere in the motor carrier regulations and therefore have minimal effect on enhancing or restricting 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 changes in this regulation affect definitions used elsewhere in the motor carrier regulations and therefore have *de minimis* effect on enhancing or restricting business activities and growth.

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

This existing regulation applies to motor carriers in the state of Kansas.

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

The changes to the regulation remove several definitions from the regulation which are already enshrined elsewhere in federal regulation. This would make the regulation shorter and easier for motor carriers to use.

- 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;**

Several definitions are being removed from the regulation because they are featured elsewhere in federal regulations already adopted. This would minimize the cost and impact on motor carriers.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 regulation does not create any new obligations on motor carriers, rather it removes separate state definitions in favor of adopting existing federal definitions.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-2a

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation grants special agents, employees and representatives of the Commission certain authorities which are required by the federal government for enforcement of motor carrier rules and regulations. The amendment to this regulation would update a reference to K.A.R. 82-4-1(d)(d), which no longer exists.

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)

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission does not anticipate a business impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This existing regulation pertains to the authority of representatives of the Commission and their abilities to regulate motor carriers in Kansas.

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

The regulation authorizes the Commission to allow for the enforcement of its rules and regulations.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features minor grammatical changes and a more precise reference to another regulation.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3b

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 40) governing the procedures for workplace drug and alcohol testing programs relevant to motor carriers. The proposed amendments seek to prevent the creation of a parallel state program and instead allow the Commission to simply enforce compliance with the federal program. Subparts D-N, P-Q and Appendices A-H are now deleted because they deal with the regulation of entities beyond the control of the Kansas Corporation Commission. The proposed also includes edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

Motor carriers operating in Kansas would continue to be subject to the same safety and fitness rules as before or as they do federally.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to mandate workplace testing of drugs and alcohol in conformity with the federal standards.

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;

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features minor grammatical changes and a more precise reference to another regulation.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3c

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 382) governing the procedures for testing for controlled substances and alcohol use. The proposed amendments seek to prevent the creation of a parallel state program and instead allow the Commission to simply enforce compliance with the federal program. The proposed also includes edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

Motor carriers operating in Kansas would continue to be subject to the same drug and alcohol testing rules as before or as they do federally.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety and fitness procedures in conformity with the federal standards.

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;

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features minor grammatical changes and a more precise reference to another regulation.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3d

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 385) governing motor carrier safety fitness procedures. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

Motor carriers operating in Kansas would continue to be subject to the same safety and fitness rules as before or as they do federally.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety and fitness procedures in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3f

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. 390) which establish the minimum safety requirements to be followed by motor carriers and their employees, the safety standards for commercial motor vehicles and intermodal equipment. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

Motor carriers operating in Kansas would continue to be subject to the same safety and fitness rules as before or as they do federally.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety and fitness procedures in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3g

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. 391) which establish the minimum duties of motor carriers with respect to the qualifications of their commercial motor vehicle drivers. This regulation also establishes the minimum qualifications for those drivers who own and operate commercial motor vehicles. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation sets out the safety rules each motor carrier and its drivers must follow during the operation of commercial motor vehicles for the purpose of transporting property, passengers and/or intermodal equipment.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3h

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. 392) which establish the minimum duties and procedures for the driving of commercial motor vehicles. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes the minimum requirements for the driving of commercial motor vehicles.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3i

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 393) governing the parts and accessories necessary for the safe operation of commercial motor vehicles. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections, deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes the minimum requirements for parts and accessories necessary on commercial motor vehicles operating in either intrastate or interstate commerce.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3j

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 396) governing the inspection, repair and maintenance of commercial motor vehicles. The proposed amendments to this regulation include minor grammar and form corrections, deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes the minimum requirements for the inspection, repair and maintenance of commercial motor vehicles.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3k

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 397) governing the transportation of hazardous materials with specific respect to driving and parking rules. The proposed amendments to this regulation reflect minor grammar and form corrections, deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes the guidelines relevant to the transportation of hazardous materials with specific respect to driving and parking rules

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-31

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 398) governing the transportation of migrant workers. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections, deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes the guidelines relevant to the transportation of migrant workers.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3m

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 399) establishing motor carrier employee safety and health standards. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections, deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes motor carrier employee safety and health standards.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-3n

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 387) establishing requirements for the minimum levels of financial responsibility for motor carriers. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes requirements for the minimum levels of financial responsibility for motor carriers.

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

The regulation allows the Commission to enforce safety rules in conformity with the federal standards.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-30

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts relevant portions of the FMCSA regulations (49 C.F.R. Part 386, Subpart F) establishing procedures relevant to imminent hazard with respect to motor carriers. The proposed amendments to this regulation include edits to reflect minor grammar and form corrections and deletions and additions required to reflect the most recent updates to FMCSA regulations.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes requirements for the minimum levels of financial responsibility for motor carriers.

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

This regulation establishes procedures relevant to imminent hazard with respect to motor carriers.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-20

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the minimum requirements and standards to be observed in the transportation of hazardous materials by motor carriers and operators of commercial motor vehicles. The proposed edits to this regulation include edits to achieve consistency with federal requirements including adopting the federal definition of “commercial motor vehicle” and “motor vehicle” instead of using a state specific definition.

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)*

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation create uniformity of enforcement between state and federal agencies.

- 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 Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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

This regulation establishes minimum requirements and standards for motor carriers involved in the transportation of hazardous materials.

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

This regulation results in uniformity between federal and state motor carrier regulations.

- 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;**

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 proposed regulation only features changes that result in less variance from the federal standards, but little substantive change.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-21

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the type of carriers that are required to file an insurance policy in compliance with K.S.A. 66-1,128. The proposed amendment would remove language referring to private motor carriers of household goods, which are an unregulated category of motor carriers.

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)

The Kansas insurance requirement is less stringent than the federal rules which require insurance policies for motor carriers travelling interstate. Kansas intrastate carriers' rules are in line with those of contiguous states. Missouri, for example, requires all motor carriers to file "Proof of Bodily Injury and Property Damage Insurance (Form E)" with the Missouri Department of Transportation.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation remove private motor carriers of household goods (an unregulated class) from those required to file an insurance policy with the Commission.

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;

This change would affect private motor carriers of household goods, removing them from the text of the regulation.

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

Private motor carriers of household good who meet exemptions listed in the Kansas statutes.

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

Removes a regulation which requires a carrier to file with the Commission that in practice does not currently file and is unregulated.

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;

The removal of private carriers of household goods from the regulation minimizes costs on such carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 removal of a class of carriers from the requirements of the statute results in less regulatory burden.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-22

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the type of carriers that are required to maintain an insurance policy in compliance with K.S.A. 66-1,128.

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)*

The Kansas insurance requirement is less stringent than the federal rules which require insurance policies for motor carriers travelling interstate, but its existence makes it incumbent on certain carriers to maintain proper insurance coverage.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation replace private motor carriers of household goods (an unregulated class) with private motor carriers of passengers (a regulated class), which were previously expected to file their insurance policies but were not included in the text of the regulation.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation remove private motor carriers of household goods (an unregulated class) from those required to file an insurance policy with the Commission.

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

This change would affect private motor carriers of household goods, removing them from the text of the regulation.

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

The removal of private carriers of household goods from the regulation minimizes costs on such carriers.

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;

The removal of private carriers of household goods from the regulation minimizes costs on such carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 removal of a class of carriers from the requirements of the statute results in less regulatory burden.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-24a

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation addresses the Commission's standards relating to the forms used by motor carriers to report the liability and property insurance for intrastate motor carriers. The proposed change removes an obligation file a specific form in order to mirror a federal change which already achieved the same result.

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 change eliminates a variance from the federal rules where the filing of the Form H is no longer an obligation.

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 Commission's changes to this regulation enhances business activities and growth by removing an obligation for common carriers to file form H of the uniform standard insurance forms with the Commission.

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 economic effect would be beneficial to intrastate common carriers who would no longer be required to file Form H with the Commission.

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

Intrastate common carriers will no longer have to file Form H with the Commission.

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

The change would be beneficial to intrastate common carriers who would no longer be required to file Form H with the Commission.

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;

Removing this obligation and mirroring the federal rule reduces confusion and ends the obligation for intrastate carriers to file Form H with the Commission.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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.

Removing this obligation and mirroring the federal rule reduces confusion and ends the obligation for intrastate carriers to file Form H with the Commission.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-27

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the procedures for filing applications for certificates of convenience and necessity and certificates of public service. The proposed change to this regulation changes a reference from the form MCS-150 to form MCSA-1 because the form was changed on the federal level.

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)

The change allows the state to reference the correct form which was changed on the federal level. The change allows for less variance between the state and the federal rules and regulations.

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 change will enhance business by reducing confusion and referencing the form currently in use.

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;

This change will have a positive economic effect in that it would allow state regulations to mirror federal regulations and updates a state regulation to reference the correct form.

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

This change would affect carriers applying for certificates of convenience and necessity and certificates of public service.

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

The change would allow for clarification and allow the state regulation to reference the correct form.

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;

This change is made to reduce the impact of conflicting state and federal rules.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 requirement has not changed on private motor carriers of passengers, but has only been added in writing to the regulation.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-30a

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation adopts federal regulations for Unified Carrier Registration that allow the State to collect registration fees under the revised Federal Unified Carrier Registration Agreement. Kansas is required to adopt by reference the UCR fee schedule to remain in compliance with the Unified Carrier Registration System.

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)

The adoption of this regulation is required by the federal government under 49 C.F.R. Part 350. Adoption of this regulation permits the Commission the ability to enforce the existing regulations as required by state and federal law.

If periodic updates to the Kansas motor carrier regulations are not conducted, the Commission becomes non-compliant with its requirement to maintain substantial compliance with the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations pursuant to 49 C.F.R. Part 350. This non-compliance would carry the following monetary consequences on both existing and future funding:

- All MCSAP Basic and Incentive funding would be suspended. No additional grant funds could be applied for; and
- Multiple state agencies (KDOR, KCC, KDOT, KHP) currently hold the following grants: MCSAP, CVISN, HP, PRISM, SaDIP and New Entrant. In addition to future applications being denied, any remaining money in these account balances would not be able to be vouchered against.

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 change further defines what a carrier's "base state" would be for purposes of complying with the UCR requirements that the regulation adopts and updates references to more recent versions of the federal statute that this regulation adopts.

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 change allows for more clarity of enforcement and compliance with the regulation. Carriers will be more aware of what their "base state" would be and allows carriers to rely on the most recently printed version of the federal regulation.

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

Carriers operating interstate that are based in Kansas.

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

The change allows for more clarity of enforcement and compliance with the regulation. Carriers will be more aware of what their "base state" would be and allows carriers to rely on the most recently printed version of the federal 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;

The Commission does not anticipate an economic impact resulting from the adoption of this proposed regulation.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the clarification of where the base state is located will allow carriers to be more certain if they believe they should be registered in another state.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-40

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This regulation prohibits passengers on property carrying vehicles. The KCC proposes revoking it because K.A.R. 82-4-40 duplicates the effect of FMCSR 49 C.F.R. 392.60, adopted by K.A.R. 82-4-3h.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-40 is not required by the federal government, but mirrors the effect of FMCSR 49 C.F.R. 392.60. Since the federal regulation is already adopted by K.A.R. 82-4-3h we will remain in compliance with the federal standard after this revocation takes effect.

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 regulation being revoked adds clarity and removes redundancy from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the revocation of this regulation, but there will be less redundancy and duplication of rules.

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

There would be no change in the rules and regulations that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of redundancy.

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

The change allows for less redundancy and confusion about which rule applies in this situation.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the clarification and elimination of the duplicative regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-42

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation outlines the Commission's procedures for obtaining emergency and occasional equipment certificates, permits and licenses. These proposed updates remove a portion of the regulation which is duplicative of FMCSR 49 C.F.R. 390.23, already adopted by 82-4-3f, which deals with emergency relief from regulations.

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)

K.A.R. 82-42 is not required by the federal government, but the portion being removed mirrors the effect of FMCSR 49 C.F.R. 390.23. Since the federal regulation is already adopted by K.A.R. 82-4-3f we will remain in compliance with the federal standard after the proposed removal of a portion of this regulation takes effect.

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 portion of the regulation being removed adds clarity and removes redundancy from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of a portion of this regulation, but there will be less redundancy and duplication of rules.

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

There would be no change in the rules and regulations that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of redundancy.

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

The change allows for less redundancy and confusion about which rule applies in this situation.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the clarification and elimination of the duplicative regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-44

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation states that common carriers discontinuing service without approval of the KCC shall be deemed in forfeiture of their certificate. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when obtaining and holding certificates was much more contentious. Common carriers no longer need Commission approval to discontinue service.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-44 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when certification was very contentious and required hearings that were often opposed by other motor carriers. A common carrier discontinuing service was a much more drastic action. That is no longer the case.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-46

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 the 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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation required intrastate common motor carriers of household goods to maintain and file a uniform system of accounts and annual reports with the KCC. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when such a regulation was necessary. Intrastate common motor carriers of household goods are not required to file any such information with the Commission currently and the regulation is not enforced.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-4-46 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when then KCC monitored such information about common motor carriers of household goods. The Commission no longer tracks such information.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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 changes to this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation.

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

The change allows removes an antiquated regulation. This benefits business by reducing the number of unnecessary or inapplicable motor carrier laws and ending a variance from the federal rules.

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;

The proposed changes to this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-48

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 the 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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation required intrastate common motor carriers of household goods to maintain and file a uniform system of accounts and annual reports with the KCC. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when such a regulation was necessary. Intrastate common motor carriers of household goods are not required to file any such information with the Commission currently and the regulation is not enforced.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-4-46 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when then KCC monitored such information about common motor carriers of household goods. The Commission no longer tracks such information.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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 changes to this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation.

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

The change allows removes an antiquated regulation. This benefits business by reducing the number of unnecessary or inapplicable motor carrier laws and ending a variance from the federal rules.

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;

The proposed changes to this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-48a

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation required prescribed rules regarding “bills of lading” and “anti-trust immunity regulations.” This regulation is no longer enforced. The proposed change would revoke this rule. This will allow Kansas to remove an antiquated and unused regulation.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-4-48a is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry. The change to this regulation allows for the state to remove an unnecessary federal variance.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state’s motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

These rule’s stated affect is on motor carriers of household good, but it is not currently enforced. The proposed change results in the elimination of an outdated regulation.

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

The change allows removes an antiquated regulation. This benefits business by reducing the number of unnecessary or inapplicable motor carrier laws.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-50/K.A.R. 82-4-51

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation required prescribed rules requiring “passenger waiting rooms.” K.A.R. 82-4-50 as well as K.A.R. 82-4-51 are no longer enforced. Instead the proposed changes replaces both with the applicable federal standard from FMCSR 49 C.F.R. Part 374. This will allow Kansas to remove two antiquated and unused regulations and end a variance from the federal rules on treatment of passengers.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-50 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry. The change to this regulation allows for the state to remove two unnecessary federal variances (K.A.R 82-4-50 and K.A.R. 82-4-51) and replace them with an adoption of the appropriate federal standard for these types of carriers.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state’s motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

These rules affect common motor carriers of passengers, but do not enact regulations that do not already apply. Rather the proposed change results in the elimination of an outdated regulation.

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

The change allows removes an antiquated regulation (K.A.R. 82-4-50) and replaces an unnecessary state variance (K.A.R. 82-4-51) and instead adopts the applicable federal rule. This benefits business by reducing the number of unnecessary or inapplicable motor carrier laws and ending a variance from the federal rules.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-53/82-4-56a

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

These regulations provides rules regarding common motor carrier rates, charges and tariffs. The proposed change clarifies that it is for carriers of household good and passengers and removes certain language and requirements for such tariffs because they are no longer applicable.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-56a is not required by the federal government, but a regulation that remains from a previous era in the motor carrier industry. The KCC continues to collect tariffs from household good and passenger carriers, but the scrutiny and rules currently imposed are much less stringent than in previous generations.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing antiquated or inapplicable aspects of the rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated portions of the regulation.

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

The change removes an unnecessary portions of the rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The removal of portions of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of outdated requirements of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-57

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation provides rules regarding common motor carriers who wish to grant power of attorney to an agent to issue and file tariffs on their behalf. The proposed change simply clarifies that “common” carriers are actually household good and passenger carriers and replaces the word “desire” with “want.”

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-57 is not required by the federal government, but a regulation that allows carriers to hire agents to file paperwork on their behalf. The KCC continues to collect tariffs from household good and passenger carriers, but the scrutiny and rules currently imposed are much less stringent than in previous generations.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing antiquated or inapplicable aspects of the rule from the state’s motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated portions of the regulation.

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

The change removes an unnecessary portions of the rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The removal of portions of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of outdated requirements of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

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

K.A.R. 82-4-58d

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation prescribes rules for financial filings requirements for abandonment of motor carrier passenger service. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when regulation of motor carriers was territory based and the ability to provide motor carrier passenger service was a highly coveted licensure to acquire.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-58d is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when regulation of motor carriers was territory based. That is no longer the case.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-63

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation deals with contested and uncontested motor carrier hearings. The proposed change removes hearings regarding “abandonment of a motor carrier certificate” from the types of motor carrier hearings that take place because this regulation was enacted at a time when obtaining and holding certificates was much more contentious. Common carriers no longer need Commission approval to discontinue service, therefore such hearings do not take place.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-4-63 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when certification was very contentious and required hearings that were often opposed by other motor carriers. A common carrier discontinuing service was a much more drastic action. That is no longer the case.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an aspect of a rule from the state’s motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of the portion of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated part of the regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary portion of a rule from the motor carrier regulations

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;

The removal of part of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of a portion of this regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-65

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation deals with “protests” of Transportation Division permitting actions. The proposed change removes hearings regarding “abandonment” of a motor carrier certificate from the types of motor carrier hearings that take place because this regulation was enacted at a time when obtaining and holding certificates was much more contentious. Common carriers no longer need Commission approval to discontinue service, therefore such hearings do not take place.

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)*

K.A.R. 82-4-65 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry when certification was very contentious and required hearings that were often opposed by other motor carriers. A common carrier discontinuing service was a much more drastic action. That is no longer the case.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an aspect of a rule from the state’s motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of the portion of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated part of the regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary portion of a rule from the motor carrier regulations

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;

The removal of part of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of a portion of this regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

- 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).**

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

- 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).**

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-66

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation states that intrastate carriers must serve within certain incorporated or unincorporated municipalities. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when the KCC regulated general commodity carriers with regards to territories. This is no longer the case.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-66 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary rule from the motor carrier regulations

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;

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-68

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the rules regarding collective rate-making agreements. The changes to the rule remove some outdated language and clarifies the types of carriers to which the rule applies.

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)*

The rule is not required by the federal rules but is a relic of a previous era in the trucking industry. Although certain carriers file collective rate-making agreements with the KCC, the proposed change limits the kinds of carriers that would need to file as written.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing its applicability to certain carriers.

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;

Fewer carriers will be subject to the this rule as a result of the changes.

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

The rule would affect fewer motor carriers under the change to the regulation.

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

The change removes an unnecessary portion of the rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The amendment of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-85

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

This existing regulation establishes the rules regarding rate applications filed by carriers that were party to a collective rate-making agreements. The changes to the rule update the language for clarity and allow such applications to be filed by electronic mail.

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)

Collective ratemaking agreements are still used in some cases but are no longer prevalent in the industry. The changes to this rule allows for them to be filed by electronic mail and clarifies language in the rule for better clarity.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by being more clear and allowing e-mail compliance.

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 economic impact would be to reduce costs for motor carriers since they could file the agreements electronically.

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

Businesses that elect to file a collective rate making agreement with the Commission.

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

The change removes an unnecessary portion of the rule from the motor carrier regulations.

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;

The amendment of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

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.

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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.

Very few motor carriers file collective rate making agreements with the KCC, but allowing them to be able to do so via email would reduce the costs and efforts of mailing.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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 who would bear the costs and would be affected by the failure to adopt the rule(s) and regulation(s).

n/a

Kansas Corporation Commission
Ahsan Latif: (785)271-3118, a.latif@kcc.ks.gov

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

K.A.R. 82-4-86

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 the Division of the Budget.

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

The regulation deals with vehicle inspection stations. The proposed change revokes this regulation because it was enacted at a time when such stations were in use. This is no longer the case.

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)

K.A.R. 82-4-86 is not required by the federal government, but is a relic of a previous era in the motor carrier industry.

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 change benefits business activities and growth by removing an unnecessary rule from the state's motor carrier regulations.

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;

Carriers will be subject to the same rules and regulations after the removal of this regulation.

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

There would be no change in the rules that affect motor carriers, only the elimination of an outdated regulation

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

The change removes an unnecessary rule from the motor carrier regulations

- 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;**

The revocation of this regulation is meant to minimize the cost and impact of the motor carrier regulations on carriers.

- 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.**

\$00.00

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.

\$00.00

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 is not a substantial change in the obligations placed on motor carriers and if anything the elimination of the regulation reduces costs facing motor carriers.

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

n/a

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).

The Commission's Transportation Division met with leaders of the Kansas Motor Carrier Association, Kansas Highway Patrol and Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration officials in Kansas to discuss changes being made to this regulation.

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).

n/a